This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH 68HL -

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION,

Period
1185.75
N. S
v. 1
1837

DEVOTED TO

Primitive Christianity;

CONDUCTED BY

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

NEW SERIES—VOL. I.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL.

1837.

Digitized by Google

Reprinted by
College Press
Box 1132
Joplin, Missouri 64801

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

We commence this new series with the experience of fourteen years' editorship, and we hope to offer some evidence to our indulgent readers that we have not been so inobservant of our own faults, or those of others, as not to have learned something in so long a time, which may be turned to a good account in our farther attempts at public edification. Our confidence in the cardinal principles of our christian profession, and of the whole complex cause of reformation which we plead, continues to increase with every year's experience. The ordeal through which these great evangelical principles of religious and political liberty—of christian faith and practice—have passed, if not absolutely confirmatory of their truth, certainly has emboldened us to defend with renewed zeal their divine authenticity, and to urge their acceptance upon our fellow-professors of all the sects into which Christendom at this hour is most unfortunately severed.

Not only the unprecedented spread and adoption of these views and principles in so short a time, evinced by the multitudes who have rallied under the banners of reform; but the visible influence which they have exerted upon large masses of society, who stand aloof, and in very uncharitable strains denounce us and them, yet yield to the sovereignty of truth by practising upon these principles, and actually teaching them, though under the disguise of an uncompromising opposition; encourage us to persevere in a cause which has the warmest commendation of both friends and foes.

The labors of the press are the greatest and most powerful means of operating upon society, a species of preaching and teaching that is fast changing the aspect of things. To keep pace, then, with the age and still to spread the principles of a radical and thorough reformation—to enlist others into the ranks, and to confirm many new converts—it appears necessary that we should continue our labors in the *restoration of original Christianity.*

Digitized by Google

There are a few points which we intend to labor with still more assiduity in the present series:—Education, intellectual and moral; Parental Influence and Obligations; Practical Piety, or Personal Reformation; the Peculiar Character of the Age, with its demands upon Christian Effort and Co-operation; Roman Catholicism; Modern Infidelity; Future Prospects. These, in addition to the usual essays and communications upon the whole subject of the Bible and the Church, will command our attention in the volume which we now commence, and in this new series.

A controversy with the Roman Catholics has already commenced, and an invitation to a discussion with the Universalists is just now received from a source entitled to much respect. These providentially coming in our way, we would judge it culpable on our part to neglect. We cannot, then, at this crisis take off the harness and lay down the Sword of the Spirit—the tongue, or the press.

Controversy began in heaven. It was coeval with the conception of sin. The theatre of war was soon translated from heaven to earth; and the Prince of errorists and apostates is instantly employed in polluting the ears of our common mother with the poisonous breath of error and falsehood. Hard by the tree of knowledge of good and evil in an unfortunate hour he gained a triumph. The controversy then began on earth, and it must continue till one of the parties is driven from the field. So long as there are two parties it must continue. It ought never to have begun, if it should cease before the great point is gained for which it was begun.

The wisest and best of human benefactors have, therefore, been controversialists. Every good man must oppose, to the full extent of his ability and opportunity, error and iniquity. Hence, from the days of Moses till the exile of John the Apostle, the most distinguished saints were the greatest controversialists. Jesus himself, the Prince of benefactors, spent almost all his life in debates and discussions, and has fully demonstrated that a person may, in all benevolence, and with a holy spirit and temper, earnestly contend against error in sentiment and practice. So will *we* do, if God permit.

Time is the preface to Eternity—an introduction to volumes whose pages, infinite in number and endless in variety, shall

Digitized by Google

contain the details of all the cycles of the universe. A careful perusal of the preface may throw considerable light upon the volume, and perhaps create a taste for examining its manifold and wonderful arcana. To take some notes of time, and from these to sermonize a moral is sometimes both pleasing and profitable. And for such a sermon, what occasion more pertinent than the moment that completes an old and commences a new revolution of time, and which admonishes us that another chapter of our destiny is finished and filed for future reference?

One thousand eight hundred years of the Christian age are passed into eternity, and have carried with them the subjects of how many volumes! The Man of Sin is now entering upon the twelve hundred and thirty-first year of his usurpation, according to our keeping of the prophetic records; and although his constitution is much impaired, yet, in moments of high excitement, after a sumptuous repast upon other times, he talks of undertakings and efforts unequal to his years, as though he were unconscious that his days are almost numbered and that the era of retribution is at hand.

We are approaching a great crisis in human history, and wise for us it were could we understand and pay a due regard to all the signs of the times. He is a dull pupil in the school of nature or of grace, who cannot improve something in sacred knowledge in the lapse of three hundred and sixty-five suns. Yet how many years are squandered for time and lost for eternity! We have thought, and talked, and read, and travelled for knowledge; and so deeply are we penetrated with a sense of its excellency, that were we possessed of the richest topaz of Ethiopia, the brightest diamond, or the costliest ruby, and were they of current value in intellectual merchandize, we should gladly exchange them for a few ideas on some of the sublime themes of heavenly science which the sacred pages of the divine volumes present to our reflections. But these are not to be purchased for such a price.

Still there is something in Heaven's estimation better than knowledge, and yet it is much cheaper. Knowledge and faith are good; hope is better; but love is best of all. "Now," says Paul, "abide faith, hope, love—these three; but the greatest of

Digitized by Google

these is love." To be perfect in love is much more attainable than to be perfect in knowledge. Love is on all sides acknowledged to be the transcendent excellency in religion which hides in the ocean of forgetfulness a multitude of sins in a brother, and stimulates its happy subject to deeds of eternal renown. It is, indeed, the magnetism of religion, the gravitating principle in morality, and the mainspring of every laudable effort at reformation. The possession of it is not more indispensable to moral goodness of character, than the display of it to usefulness in society. The want of it has filled the world with countless volumes which ought never to have been written, for their memory will be forever painful to their authors. So much philosophy and heavenly science is there in the apostolic suggestion, "Let all things be done with love."

Whether, then, we speak or write in words acceptable to all, we assure our readers that we shall pay a supreme regard to that holy and heavenly principle, and suffer not a word to go abroad that flows not from a benevolent or a Christian affection recommended and sanctioned by the precepts and examples of Prophets and Apostles, speaking by the Holy Spirit, which is a spirit of love as well as of knowledge and understanding in the counsels and purposes of the heavenly Father. Truth and love have made us free, and as a tribute of regard for them we shall inscribe to them all our pages, and honor them with the best efforts of our head and of our heart, whether we speak or write on the things of time or eternity.

A. C.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER I.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *January*, 1837.

THE POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. I.*

EVERY object of contemplation may be viewed in various attitudes and relations, because no created thing exists only for its own sake. There are as many dependencies as creatures in the universe, and consequently as many relations. The mighty whole is but the aggregate of innumerable parts; and of all these there is not one independent of the rest, or unrelated to them. This is not more true or more worthy of observation in the material than in the intellectual system.

Religion, therefore, of all subjects the most comprehensive and sublime, is capable of being placed in many points of view before the mind, and of being regarded in reference to every human relation and circumstance. A clear and full perception of this great truth is one of the best antidotes against a narrow, illiberal, and dogmatic spirit.

We occasionally read and speak of the theory of religion and of the practice. We have religion objectively and subjectively discussed. We have the substance and the form, the matter and the spirit, the attributes and the accidents of religion. We have also the doctrines, the precepts, and the promises—the laws, the statutes, and the ordinances of religion. In other words, religion is capable not so much of divisions and subdivisions of this sort, as of being contemplated and regarded in all these bearings upon the individual and society. We are at this time, however, only intent on viewing religion in reference to its power in forming character—to its influence upon the heart and upon the life of man. That distinction, therefore, expressed by the Apostle in his second letter to Timothy between "the *form*" and "the *power* of godliness," is more apposite to our present design than any other.

Digitized by Google

We do not intend to regard the *form* and the *power* of godliness as antagonist, or in the slightest degree opposed, to each other. They are distinct, but not contradictory terms, or ideas, or conditions of the same thing. The form without the power is conceivable; but the power without the form is impossible. The power of an instrument to keep time, and the form of that instrument, are easily distinguished; but how often do we see the form of such instrument, clock or watch, without this power: but who ever saw this power without a form!

Ever since Satan seduced and polluted our first progenitors, and alienated their affections from the Lord their Creator, our heavenly Father, from a due regard to his own dignity and the other portions of his immense empire, hid his face from us, and is no longer visibly present in these his lower works. Yet in the deep and unfathomable mines of the unsearchable riches of his manifold wisdom and love, he has instituted on earth a system of remedies adapted to the whole nature and genius of man, and to the preternatural complexion of his circumstances. This is what the master spirits of Protestantism call "the religion of the Bible;" an institution which, as it is one of the most splendid conceptions of the Infinite Intelligence, bears deeply imprinted upon its surface, and infused into its essence, the glorious attributes of its author. But in our intellectual and moral imbecilities we are apt to take both feeble and partial views of its divine excellency, and often to be wholly engrossed with one of its attributes or accidents, to the disparagement, neglect, or forgetfulness of all the rest. Hence how often is the power, and purity, and holiness of the gospel forgotten or overlooked in the fierce and hostile controversies about its forms, its precepts, and its ordinances.

The form of godliness, as well as its power, just as "the form of truth" in the Decalogue, and the truth itself, is indeed celestial and divine. True religion, whether in mode or substance, in matter or spirit, in form or power, is a native of the skies. It is heaven-born, heaven-descended, and heaven-destined. It came from God, and it leads to God. It is therefore the wisdom, the grace, and the power of God in every person who embraces it. Yet in all our zeal and contentions for the simplicity, appropriateness, and excellency of its forms, we should never forget the purity, the mildness, the gentleness, and the holiness of its spirit and its power.

Religion printed on paper, religion existing in the perceptions of the understanding, religion flowing from the lips and floating in the air, and religion dwelling in the heart, and living and breathing in every thought, and word, and action, are very different and distinct conceptions and predicaments. Religion printed upon paper is the work of

Digitized by Google

human science and art, which can be performed as well by the mechanical skill of the atheist as by that of the Christian. Religion existing in the perceptions of the understanding is as natural and easy as the theory of astronomy or electricity, and can be obtained by the same talent and application which master any branch of mental or moral philosophy, and is often one of the literary and scientific accomplishments of the most grossly immoral and profane spirits of the age. Religion flowing from the lips, or falling upon the ear, differs in no respect from the enunciations of our vocal powers on other themes; and therefore preachers, orators, lawyers of good lungs and distinct articulation, may equally entertain, amuse, or terrify their audience, according to all the varieties of times, subjects, and circumstances.

But religion dwelling in the heart, rooted in the feelings and affections, is a living, active, and real existence. It purifies the fountain of moral life and health. It animates, inspires, controls, and gives a new impulse to our active powers. It imbues the soul with a divine life, and plants the incorruptible seeds of a glorious immortality in man. This is religion; all the rest is machinery or imagery. Language and all its signs, oral and written; ordinances and all their forms, as types, and paper, and ink, are but the means or channel through which the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit plants or waters the undecaying germ of an eternal life in the intellectual and moral nature of man.

Religion in the Bible, in the understanding, in the lips, and in the heart, may be pictured out to the child of nature by that *life-giving light*, which, while it emanates from the sun, is not in the sun, nor in the rays nor undulations from the sun, nor in the air through which it passes, nor in the eye which sees it; but which, while it paints the images of things upon the retina, by its control of other agencies sets in motion the animal machinery, imparts warmth and vigor, and strikes life into the man.

Such, in part, are the phenomena of that animal life which man in common with other animated beings receives from the laws of Nature, arranged and directed by the Supreme Intelligence. That vital spark which enlivens the animal creation, like that stricken from the flint by the touch of steel, is distinct equally from the hand that guides, from the steel in contact, and the flint that is stricken by it; yet without this economy and collision, that spark which now beams light and cheerfulness around the social hearth had never begun to be.

It is indeed impossible fully to depict in colors incapable of confusion, that wonderful process by which either animal or spiritual life is infused into man. The microscope with all its powers cannot detect the delicate touches of the hand of Nature in the inmost recesses of its

Digitized by Google

sublime operations. No more can language explain, or faith apprehend, that agency of truth or of grace which quickens the soul, sets in motion its powers and gives them a bias to the skies. But that the thing is done, and that man is morally and spiritually a new creation is as clearly taught and as faithfully propounded to our acceptance as that Jesus Christ is the author of an eternal salvation to all that obey him.

Types we have, and beautiful figures innumerable; but our prejudices and other malign influences around us interpose and veto the use of Nature's own imagery and her analogies, from the persuasion that the more unapproachable and mysterious the wonders of creation, providence, and regeneration, the better for the interests of religion and morality. Although we cannot, *ex-animo*, subscribe to this *dictum* of the untaught and unteachable, still we can bear with that fastidiousness which forbids the help of one of God's volumes to illustrate and explain the other; provided only, we may not be registered amongst the chief of heretics and schismatics; because, in imitation of the great Author of our religion, we sometimes throw our eyes over the volume of Nature for a simile or a comparison, by the help of which to set forth more intelligibly and vividly our conceptions of the revealed secrets of the Kingdom of Heaven.

To return: Religion in the heart, or rooted in the moral nature of man, transfuses itself through the whole frame and identity of its happy and holy subject. It crystalizes every thing in human nature that can be immortalized, and sheds a divine gracefulness over all the workings of the human soul. It distils the dews of heaven upon the heart—it breathes a delicious odor on society, and imbues with a heavenly sweetness the temper and conversation of the happy spirits who cherish its divine and holy influences by submitting to all its sacred ordinances and requisitions. Its active power never shines with more splendor than when most oppressed. Hindrances, difficulties, dangers, but increase its momentum and impart a peculiar lustre and heroism to all its efforts and enterprizes. The more it is oppressed the more it aspires towards heaven whence it descended, and the more efficiently it struggles with every weight and entangling influence which would retard its flight to the supreme object on which cluster all its pure and holy affections.

There is no exaggeration here. In the prosecution of this subject it will more and more appear that Christian faith, hope, and love are a three-fold cord of more than earthly strength—a mainspring incomparably superior to all the other springs of human action—the power of God stirring up the divinity that is within us, urging man to a conquest of more glory than ever adorned an earthly triumph. It will appear that

Digitized by Google

there is no hyperbole in saying with the Apostle John, that faith conquers the world, and that the Christian is the only hero that shall wear a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

A. C.

CONSISTENCY.

O, house of Israel! are not my ways equal?

EZEK. xvii. 29.

THERE is no attribute of character more highly or universally esteemed than CONSISTENCY. It is this quality which gives power and dignity to virtue; and which, when possessed by the vicious, extorts even for them an unwilling tribute of respect. At the present period of the world, whether in politics, or religion, or in any of the various pursuits or relations in which character is involved, or by which it is impressed, a want of consistency is regarded as the highest mark of weakness and imbecility. The ancients, on the other hand, have forcibly expressed their regard for it by the pretty fable concerning the island of Delos, which is said to have floated upon the surface of the Ægean sea, the sport of the winds and waves, until, as a reward for having given refuge to Latona, Jupiter promised to give its inhabitants whatever they should desire: "Grant us," said they, "a permanent location and a fixed abiding-place, so that we may no longer move about."

Consistency, however, is not, any more than strength or courage, or any other attribute of body, mind, or character, to be loved for its own sake, irrespective of the way in which it is employed, or the principles by which it is directed. The atheist, the sensualist, and the traitor may act in perfect conformity with their characters, and with the false reasoning by which, in seeking to justify, they deceive themselves; as strength and bravery may in like manner be displayed by the robber or the assassin. The serpent is not to be admired because his bite is ever deadly, nor is the lion to be caressed on account of his courage and his power.

On the contrary, firmness of purpose is valuable only when the purpose itself is so; and perseverance is to be commended only when the pursuit is worthy of commendation. It is by the standard which constitutes the rule of action, that the merits of consistency can alone be measured; for there can be no conformity where there is no model, and, this being defective, there can be no praise in being wrong according to a fixed rule, and consistent only with imperfection. The first step,

Digitized by Google

therefore, in order to attain elevation of character, is to adopt just and elevated principles: the second is, to seek a perfect conformity to the standard thus selected.

To apply these remarks to morality and religion:—We would say, that as the Divine Being is himself the true standard of excellence, the Bible, in which alone is contained an authentic record of his character and will, becomes the only rule of rectitude and duty to the Christian; and that he is the most perfect Christian who is the most conformed to the principles and precepts of this Divine revelation. All other standards in religion, whether styled traditions, decrees, bulls, creeds, catechisms, confessions, or formularies, are therefore rejected, since, being of human origin, they are liable to be imperfect or erroneous, and must of necessity be inferior. No one whose lips have not been hallowed by the sacred fire of inspiration, is adequate to exhibit the divine character as it is presented by the Bible in its history of the world, its comparisons, its contrasts, its pencillings of celestial excellence, and its inimitable descriptions; nor is any one competent to express the requirements of the divine law in other and better language than that of the Holy Spirit. "Which things," says Paul, "we speak not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit, explaining spiritual things in spiritual words."

It is the unhappy consequence of employing other religious standards than the Bible, that an assimilation to the character of the Divine Being and an entire submission to his will are thereby prevented. For it is obvious that these systems of divinity, supposing even that they contained no error, can present only that amount of knowledge which was possessed by the men who compiled them. No sooner, therefore, is this information received, than improvement ceases: the pupil has become as wise as his teachers, yet perhaps neither the teachers nor the taught have learned a tithe of what is revealed in the sacred Record. 'Growth in knowledge and in favor' ceases therefore, not because there is nothing to learn, but because, whether intentionally or not, an imperfect system has been substituted for a perfect one, and a human for a Divine standard. It need not be urged here that such an effect will be prevented by the use of both the Bible and the standard. As this formulary is for the express purpose of presenting the important and fundamental truths of religion, and detecting erroneous sentiments, if any thing not therein contained be learned from the Bible, consistency regards it as not essential; and should any thing be discovered in the Bible contrary to the standard, it will be rejected by the same consistency which makes this standard the criterion of both truth and error;—the touchstone as well of the Bible as of heresy.

Digitized by Google

The Christian, therefore, who desires to "stand perfect and complete in all the will of God," is careful to allow no encroachments upon his liberties; and permits no opinions or traditions of men, whether written or unwritten, to restrict his investigations, or set bounds to his improvement. He not only, in taking the Bible alone, receives truth, and rejects every thing except the truth, but is determined to know and to enjoy the whole truth. We may then remark respecting the consistency of the Christian, that it is of inestimable value, since the standard he has selected for knowledge, duty, and character, is of the most exalted nature, being even the revealed truth, will, and character of God. And in the second place we may observe that his consistency involves constant alteration and improvement. The steps which he ascends reach even to the heavens, where alone he can be permitted to repose.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the Christian should possess immutability. This is to imagine either that he has attained perfection, or that he has ceased to advance towards it. God is infinitely perfect; he is therefore unchangeable; "without variableness or shadow of turning"—"the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever." But man, who is so imperfect, can be immutable only while imperfection is his standard; and the religionist who boasts of being always the same, glories in a human model. It is the Bible which, like the other works of God, ever reveals new beauties the more minutely it is studied; and that Christian is inconsistent with his principles who has ceased to improve either in knowledge, or in character. Increase of knowledge involves a corresponding change of conduct, and though he may be inconsistent with himself (so to speak) at different periods of his course, it is his glory and his honor, if, in being thus inconsistent with himself, he has become more consistent with the Sacred Standard. He steers for a celestial port, and though he may often be obliged to tack, he still pursues his course; nor does he ever think of stopping at the barren rock in the midst of the ocean, which, though immoveable, can afford no secure harbor; but, on account of its very immobility, may wreck his vessel.

Consistency, however, has been after all a rare virtue among men, and is difficult of attainment. Where are the men who have steadily adhered to their first principles! Where is the institution which has not been corrupted! Where is the economy human or divine, social, religious, or political, which has not perished! Though they may have been perfect in their origin as the new-born infant, they have been infected by vicious maladies ere the dawn of youth, and tottering with the infirmities and decrepitude of age even before maturity, they ceased to exist, and are either buried in oblivion, or perchance preserved, like an

Digitized by Google

Egyptian mummy, as a memorial of past ages. The history of the world is but the history of republics overcome by despotism, and freedom conquered by oppression; of truth corrupted by error, and religion converted into superstition. And shall new attempts to elevate and restore mankind be more successful? Shall the day which has now dawned be more healthful and serene, or the returning spring which now blossoms be followed by a better harvest? Certainly not, unless the noxious exhalations from the earth are dissipated; and unless, taught by experience, we carefully eradicate those luxuriant weeds by which the highest hopes have been heretofore disappointed.

The difficulties which attend consistency arise from various sources. The love of change and variety is often the sole cause of the abandonment of objects and designs fraught with the greatest ultimate benefits. That which has grown familiar has become equally tiresome, and hasty impatience cannot brook the delay which is absolutely necessary to fruition. Human pride is another obstacle. Men are so enamoured of themselves that they cannot endure to acknowledge imperfection. If they have once departed from the standard which they have chosen, and committed themselves before the public by a certain course of conduct, they are prone to justify and persevere in it, in despite of the principles which they at first professed; for which principles, indeed, they insensibly substitute their own conduct, and thus make themselves the standard of their own consistency. They prefer consistency with themselves to consistency with truth, and would rather be upbraided with error than unsteadiness. The same reason indeed will often induce men to adhere to an imperfect standard, even when convinced of its defects, lest it should be supposed that it were possible for them ever to have been mistaken in their choice.

A third hindrance of consistency is, that it often requires a degree of self-denial and of laborious and persevering effort wholly at variance with that love of ease which is so congenial to human nature. To will is easy—to execute is difficult. A single exertion may be made with facility, but perseverance induces exhaustion and fatigue. A child can readily elevate his arm to a horizontal position; but the full grown man cannot keep his arm in that position for ten minutes. It requires no great effort to take a single step in ascending the mountain, whose top reaches to the skies; but the dangers and ruggedness of the road increase as the traveller proceeds; his weary limbs refuse their office; his feet are lacerated by the pointed rocks, and his heart is chilled in the regions of perpetual snow.

It is evident that the latter of these difficulties will be increased in proportion as the standard of perfection is elevated, as it is easier to

Digitized by Google

surmount the Cheviot hills than the Alps or Andes: and it is this which renders most difficult the consistency of the Christian. Were it not, indeed, that he is cheered by the glorious prospects which open to his view as he leaves the plain and ascends towards heaven: were it not that he is guided by Infinite Wisdom, and sustained by the hand of Omnipotence, his enterprize would be vain. Thus supported, however, he will attain the lofty elevation which he seeks. Meanwhile, he rejoices that if his labors are great, so will be his rewards: if his hopes are high, so are his destinies: and that He 'whose ways are equal,' and who renders to every man according to his works, will provide him with a habitation adapted to his character, in that happy region where Pleasure teaches knowledge, and Joy alone exacts obedience.

R. R.

NOTES OF APOSTACY.—*NO. I.*

MIXED MOTIVES.

It is much to be regretted that there is yet one immense blank in the literature of the age; on a subject, too, of transcendant importance; which, at this time appears to be irremediable. We have no standard, no authentic history of Christianity. This is to be lamented not only for the sake of reform, but of philosophy, of literature, and especially of politics, which stand much in need of that peculiar light which a faithful and complete history of the Christian religion, as connected with the history of Rome and of the world, would throw upon them. We have, indeed, the chronicles of the Latin and Greek Churches, and of the Protestant Reformation; we have also many books called Church Histories, and notices of innumerable heresies, ancient and modern. But where shall we find amongst them all a history of Christianity!

We read of the ancient Puritans, or Novatians, who separated A. D. 251, from the Catholics.* Then of the humble followers of Lucifer of Sardinia, and the sect of Ærius spread over Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, about the close of the 4th century, who, as Mosheim tells us, sought to bring back Christianity to its primitive simplicity.† Then of the Donatists, who, for three centuries, from the beginning of the 4th to the beginning of the 7th century, along with the Novatians, plead the same cause of purity and righteousness against the Catholics. Then of the Paulicians, who, so soon as the Donatists began to lag, about

* Jones' Church History, p. 180, 183.

† Mosheim, vol. 1. chap. 4. This is not the Arius author of the Arian heresy.

Digitized by Google

the middle of the 7th century, separated themselves from the strong party who called themselves Catholics, and carried on the war of the Puritans, Ærians, and Donatists, till the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Lollards lifted up their voice against innovation and apostacy. Then of the Reformers, who, under Luther, Calvin, Zuingle, Melancthon, Carlostadt, and others, with still more success opposed the corruptions of the major or Catholic party.

Yet in all the histories and notices we have of these two parties—(the one sometimes designated "Catholic," the other by various accidents, or by the names of different leaders)—we have not even a complete narrative of them, much less a full and authentic history of the fates and fortunes of Christianity. Indeed, the infidel and insidious, but eloquent Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," has almost, if not altogether, written as satisfactory a history of Christianity as can be gleaned from those books purposely devoted to ecclesiastical affairs.

It is, upon the whole, questionable whether, if all the volumes extant on church affairs were placed in the hands of a Hume, or a Gibbon; or of a person of equal or superior historic talents, a full and perfect history of our religion from the beginning could be elicited. Of this we are indeed extremely dubious; because in the most controversial periods of church history there were no disinterested or accomplished neutrals to write a true and faithful history; and the feelings and rival interests of the partizan actors in that great drama wholly disqualified them for such a work. Then, in the less controversial ages of Christianity, the profligacy and corruptions of the reigning party could not be faithfully laid before their contemporaries, and consequently have never been transmitted to posterity.

To a person of observation on what is now passing in the world, the impossibility of getting from any party a fair history of its rival, will appear more evident than ninety-nine in a hundred of the most popular opinions of the day. Now, as in most cases the biography of men and statements of their views are written by friends or foes, they are inevitably tinctured, more or less, with the peculiar color of the prejudices or partialities of their authors. The rarest talent in the world is that divine talent of narrating, or stating an event just as it happened—the talent of representing a thing just as it is, or was, without a single alteration or variation. In any case this is difficult; but how much more when the passions or feelings of the individual are enlisted on the one side or the other of the subject of the story!

All who are conversant with the principles for which we plead, and with the events of the reformation now in progress, can appreciate how ill-qualified our opponents would be to write a correct history of these

Digitized by Google

matters. The representations so often made, even by the most judicious and candid of our antagonists, I need not add, would be rather a caricature, than a fair representation of our sentiments and efforts. And they are as honorable, and as truth-loving, and truth-telling opposers, as were those who honored the Novatians, the Donatists, the Paulicians, the Waldenses, the Lollards, and the Protestants with the illustrious titles of *errorists*, *heretics*, and *schismatics*.

And amongst our friends there are but few so free from enthusiasm, of so cool and dispassionate a temperament, as to state, without embellishment or addition, the events and incidents of our own history with which they are most intimately acquainted. When, then, we judge of the past from the present, we feel what rebate and discount must be allowed in perusing the documents which have come down to us on this most exciting and absorbing of all subjects—the history of the church.

We have, however, an authentic and invaluable history of primitive Christianity, for which we can never be sufficiently thankful, in the book usually styled "the Acts of the Apostles." From this sacred sketch, drawn under the guidance of the Spirit of Revelation, which conducts us to the 63d year of our era, and to Paul a prisoner in Rome, connected as it is with the apostolic epistles, we have a most clear and faithful delineation of Christianity in the undegenerate days of its uncorrupted and divine simplicity. From these documents all the ends of the earth and all the ages of time may learn what it was in the days of its virginity.

From these sacred records we moreover learn, that the founders of this heavenly economy anticipated that an apostacy, radical and wide-spreading, should one day cover the territories gained to Immanuel. Of this apostacy they have also kindly drawn the essential characteristics. Aided by these intimations, and the various volumes called ecclesiastic histories, if we cannot derive a clear and satisfactory history of the progress of our religion—of its various accidents, hindrances, and successes, we can at least discover how far it has been corrupted, and what were the first causes of defection and apostacy. To ascertain and point these out may contribute something to the cause of reformation, and may serve as an admonition to those most ardently devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity.

As a historic fact of some importance, we would here emphatically observe, that if Christianity *was persecuted by its enemies, it was corrupted by its friends*. The enemies of the Cross sorely vexed the Christians; but the Christians, without intending it, grievously perplexed the religion. Without intending to change its nature or to sully its celestial purity, actuated by the best feelings to society, and by the highest admiration of its excellency, they sought to accommo-

Digitized by Google

date its institutions, more or less, to the prejudices and capriciousness of the times; and thus inadvertently vitiated its character, obscured its glory, and weakened its influence upon the world.

This desire to accommodate the doctrine, or the requirements of the Christian religion, to the taste and predilections of Jews and Gentiles, may be regarded as the cause and origin of all the corruptions of the gospel institution, so far as *design* is implicated in this matter. Few, if any, of our actions, proceed from a single motive. Most of them, indeed, proceed from a combination of motives, not always homogeneous, but frequently of a mixed nature. Hence it sometimes happens that the most metaphysical casuist may occasionally exhaust all his resources of discrimination, without finding a satisfactory solution of the complex character of some of these compounds of motives which influence to the performance of certain actions. Whether it be the first or the last of all the motives which gives a moral or an immoral hue to the whole series, is not to be made so plain that every person may perceive it. But every person may understand that actions sometimes proceed from a mixture of benevolence and selfishness. Commodus, for example, very much desired to see his Pagan relatives and friends converted to the faith of Christ; but the Pagan superstition under which they lived was exceedingly imposing in some of its rites and ceremonies, while the Christian religion was destitute of the pomp, parade, and splendor of a sacred ritual. It had nothing worldly, no earthly glory to recommend it. Commodus, anxiously desirous of enlarging the church and of saving his relations and neighbors, recommended the addition of a few rites and ceremonies not at all repugnant to the genius of the gospel, as he imagined, while they would greatly please his friends and facilitate their conversion. By this accommodation of the Christian institution to Pagan notions he succeeded in enlarging the borders of the church and in converting his friends; and thus both his pride and benevolence were pleased and gratified by the experiment.

Peter the Apostle seems once to have felt the power of this cooperation, as evinced in his accommodating himself to the freedom of the Gentiles in eating meats and again refusing in presence of the Jews. In this, however, he went so far as to merit an admonition from Paul; because, in favoring the prejudices of one party, he was offering violence to those of the other; and still worse, by his example was giving an incorrect representation of the gospel. Still, however, it is expedient to accommodate one's self to the prejudices of society in matters of indifference in order to do them good. The delicate point, therefore, is to know how far the accommodation may be carried. This will deserve a portion of our attention as we pursue the causes of the Apostacy.

Digitized by Google

Meanwhile, we have found one of the most active and influential causes of the corruption of the Christian religion in the wish to augment the proselytes, by accommodating the religion to their prejudices. History avers the facts corroborative of these views: for it proves that in the effort to bring the Pagans into the church, the Christian institution was partially Paganized; while in the attempt to please the Jews, the elements of Judaism, the weak and beggarly elements of the world, began to be incorporated with the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven; and still there was, in all probability, more of benevolence than of pride, more of esteem than of disrespect for the Christian institution in all this. A. C.

"UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS."

As an item of "the Catholic Rule of Faith," as they call it, *the unanimous consent of the Fathers* holds a very solemn and conspicuous position. I say, *solemn;* for in the Creed of Pius IV., which concentrates into a very brief symbol the Decrees of the last of the General Councils of the days of Romanism, which held during 18 years its 25 sessions at Trent, this solemn pledge is given in the form of a definitive oath—"NOR WILL I EVER TAKE OR INTERPRET IT" [the Sacred Scripture] "OTHERWISE THAN ACCORDING TO THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS."*

Concerning this part of the Roman Catholic "Rule of Faith" we are not now to descant largely. We have introduced it here for another purpose. In the approaching discussion it may deserve a more special attention. We can only now remark, that *the unanimous consent of the Fathers* is as perfect a non-entity as "the philosopher's stone," or "the elixir of immortal youth." It has no place in heaven, earth, or hell. It was not, is not, nor ever more shall be. They contradict each other, and the Popes, and the Councils, and the Creeds, and the modern-ancient Church of Rome, as often as she has crowned her Popes, or enrolled saints within her calendar, or released the sinful saints from purgatory.

Of these ancient, and venerable, and sainted, fallible Fathers, some are Greek and some are Latin. The most ancient and venerable, of course, belong to the Greek language, people, and Church. I introduce the subject here for the purpose of showing their unanimous consent on one point in favor of a practice which is upturning and will upturn the

* The words are, "Nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum patrum accepiam et interpretabor.

Digitized by Google

whole Roman Hierarchy. If there be any consent at all among the Fathers, it is in recommending upon all, and to all, the necessity, utility, and importance of reading the sacred Scriptures, as the true and only faithful source of faith and morals.

Clement, who, according to Eusebius, Du Pin, and the Catholic Church, was Bishop of Rome; under whose pontificate (!!) John the Apostle lived and died!! writes about the year 93, in the name not of *Pope* Clement, but of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth. He exhorts all the members of that church in the following words:—

"Brethren, look into the Holy Scriptures, which are the true words of the Holy Ghost. You know that *there is nothing unjust or counterfeit in them.* There you will find that righteous men were never cast off by them that were good themselves. Take the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle into your hands. What was it that he wrote to you at his first preaching of the gospel among you? You know, beloved, *you know full well, the Holy Scriptures, and have thoroughly searched into the Oracles of God;* call them, therefore, to your remembrance."

Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippians, written in 116 or 117, says, "The blessed and renowned Paul——did, with all exactness and soundness, teach the word of truth: and being gone from you did write an epistle to you, into which, if you look, *you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith that has been delivered to you.*——I trust that *you are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures*, and that nothing is hid from you." Thus writes St. Polycarp to the Philippians.

Tertullian, who flourished from 194 to 216, says, "I adore the plenitude of the Scriptures." In his book against Hermogenes he says, "Let this man's school show that it is in the Scriptures: *if it is not in the Scriptures*, let him fear the curse against those who add to or diminish." Paris ed., p. 241.

Basil, born 326, a Greek Father, says, "The hearers that are instructed in the Scriptures *must examine the doctrines of their teachers;* they must receive those things which are agreeable to Scripture, and reject what are contrary to it." *In moralium Regula, 72, in initio.* Yet, says the Council of Trent, "The oral traditions of the Catholic Church are to be received with equal piety* and reverence as the books of the Old and New Testaments; and he that despiseth these traditions is accursed."† Council of Trent, 4th Sess. Decree concerning the Scriptures.

Let us hear St. Basil again, who is of high authority with the Romanists. "It is necessary," says he, "for those that are young in religion to learn the Scriptures, that the mind may be well confirmed in piety, and that they may *not be accustomed to human traditions.*"

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, who flourished about the year 350, and died in 386, in his Catechism translated and published 16 years after the Council of Trent, says, "It behooveth us not to deliver the very least thing of the holy mysteries of faith without the Holy Scriptures: that is the sincerity of our faith, not that which is from our own inventions, but from demonstrations of the Holy Scripture."

We shall again refresh our recollections by transcribing a few words from the Decrees of the 4th Session of the infallible Council of Trent. "It belongs to the Church to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture; and that no person shall dare to interpret it in matters relating to faith and manners, to any sense contrary to that which the Church has held, and does still hold; or *contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*"

Now let us hear *St. Chrysostom*, who is one of the most eloquent of the Greek Fathers:— "I always exhort," says he, "and will never cease to exhort you, that you will not only attend to the things spoken to you here; but when you are at home, you continually busy

---

* *Pari pietatis affectu, ac reverentia suscepit ac veneratur.*

† *Si quis—Traditionis praedictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit.*

Digitized by Google

yourselves in reading the Holy Scriptures; which practice also I have not ceased to drive into them which privily come to me." Homil. iii. on Lazar."

Again—"Sayest thou, O man! it is not for thee to turn over the Scriptures, who art distracted with cares? Nay, it is for thee more than for them, &c."—"The Spirit of God has so dispensed this word, that publicans, fishers, tent-makers, shepherds, goatherds, and even the most illiterate men may be saved by these books." Homil. in Genes. 29. "Hear I beseech you, all ye secular men; provide for yourselves Bibles, which are the medicines for the soul: at least get the New Testament." Again—"All things are intelligible and straight in the Divine Scripture: all things that are necessary are clear." Homil. iii. on 2 Thess. ii. Again—"Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of all evils." Homil. ix. on Colos. iii. And finally—"The knowledge of the Holy Bible is a powerful defence against sin: while an ignorance of them is a deep precipice, a profound gulph! It is a great betraying of salvation to know nothing of the Divine Law, it is this ignorance which has given birth to heresies! They have occasioned the corruption of morals!" Third Sermon on Lazar.

Add to this another saying of this venerable Father; "The canon ceases to be the canon if any thing is added to or taken away from it." Hom. iii. on Phil. iii.

We shall next hear the great and renowned Father *Jerome*, born A. D. 340. "The Church of Christ, who has churches in the whole world, is united by the unity of the Spirit; and has the cities of the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, and the Apostles; *she has not gone forth from her boundaries, &c. that is, from the Holy Scriptures.*" Tom. 5. p. 334. Paris edit. of 1602. Again—"But the word of God smiteth the other things, which they spontaneously discover, and *feign as it were, by an apostolical authority, without the authority and testimony of Scripture.*" Comment in Hag. c. 1, Tom. 5. p. 506. Again—"The Lord will speak in the Scriptures to the people: in the Holy Scriptures; which are read to the people with the intent that all may understand it." "As the Apostles wrote, so also the Lord hath spoken—that is, by the gospels; not in order that a few, but that all may understand." "The Chiefs of the Church, and the Chiefs of Christ did not write to a few, but to the whole people. And see what he says of the Princes, that is, of the Apostles and the Evangelists who were in her. He says who *were*, not *are*, so that, *with the exception of the Apostles, whatever should afterwards be said, should be cut off, and should henceforth have no authority.*" Tom. vii. p. 259. Paris edit. 1602.

Athanasius, who flourished about 340, of famous memory, deposes: "If ye are the disciples of the gospel, speak not unrighteously against God; but walk in the things that are written. But if you will speak any thing besides that which is written, why do you contend against us, who are determined neither to hear nor to speak any thing but that which is written? The Lord himself says, If ye continue in my word, ye are truly free!" On the Incarn. of Christ. Paris edit. of 1627.

Once more—"*For the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient for the discovery of truth.*"

His list of the Apochrypha and of the canonical Scriptures tallies exactly with the Protestant lists.

Augustine, the great Catholic Saint, of ten-folio-memory, the Bishop of Hippo, born 354, died 430, is redundant on this "unanimous consent of the Fathers." He says, "The city of God detests doubts, as the madness of the Academicians. For she believes the Sacred Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments, which we call canonical; whence our faith is derived, whereby the just lives; and by means of which we walk without wavering." Civ. Dei. lib. 19. c. 18. vol. 7. Paris edit. of 1685.

Again—"Who is ignorant that the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are contained within certain limits; and that it is to be preferred to all the subsequent writings of Bishops; so that no one can doubt, or dispute concerning it, whether whatsoever is written in it be true and right." On Baptism against the Donatists, lib. 2 c. 3. vol. 7.

Again—"In things which are openly set forth in the Scriptures, those things are to be found which comprise faith and moral conduct." On Chr. Doctr. lib. 2. c. 9. vol. 3.

Digitized by Google

Again—"There are, undoubtedly, Books of the Lord, whose authority both of us acknowledge, which we mutually believe and obey. Here let us seek the church; here let us discuss our doctrines, &c." "I will not have the holy church proved by human documents, but by Divine oracles." Tom. 9. p. 341.

Again—"Read these things to us from the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels, apostolical writings; read, and we will believe." Don. chap. 6.

Again in his Tract 2. in Epist. Johan. he says, "Against treacherous errors God would place our strength in the Scriptures; against which none that would, any way, seem a Christian, dares to speak."

Again—"Whether the Donatists hold the church, let them only show by the canonical books of Scripture. For neither do we say they should follow us, that we are in the Church of God, because Optatus or Ambrose had commended this Church unto us, which we now hold; or because it is acknowledged by the councils of our fellow-teachers; or because so great miracles are done in it: it is not, therefore, manifested to be true and catholic. *But it is the will of Christ that his disciples should be confirmed by the testimony of the Law and Prophets.* These are the rules of our cause: these are the foundations: these are the confirmations." Aug. in Psalm 69. Bishop Hall, p. 592, folio.

"John testifies that Christ hath said, and did many things that are not written. *But those things were selected to be written which seemed to suffice for the salvation of believers.*" In John. Tract 49. vol. 3. p. 619.

On the style of the Scriptures and their intelligibility we might hear him once more—"The manner of expression in which the Holy Scriptures are framed, although it is to be penetrated by few, is accessible to all. Those plain things which it speaks to the heart of the unlearned and learned, like a familiar friend, without disguise. That mind which is inimical to this doctrine is either erroneously ignorant that it is most wholesome, or loathes the medicine from disease." *Ep. ad Volusianum.*

Again—"God has bowed the Scriptures to the capacity of babes and sucklings, as he hath in another psalm, He bowed the heavens and came down."

Any person who wishes for more testimony on the subject of the "unanimous consent," may find it at the end of Archbishop Tillotson on the "Rule of Faith."

"The unanimous consent of the Fathers" is to be learned from 35 folio volumes. Augustine himself furnished 10, and Chrysostom 13 folios. But these are little more than a fourth part of the Roman Catholic Rule of Faith: for there are 18 Œcumenical Councils, whose decisions and decrees are found, according to Manses' Collection, in 31 folio volumes. There is, moreover, a great book of "bulls" in 8 vols. folio; and then the Actæ Sanctorum, or Acts of the Saints, in 51 folio volumes, written in an unknown tongue. These together make 135 huge volumes, which, with the Bible and the Apochrypha, make both the Faith and the Rule of Faith of the Catholic Church. And even yet her faith is not made perfect without (no one can tell how many) oral and unwritten traditions. May we not say, O, Rome! how *great* is thy faith!!

How learned must that Priest be in the Latin and Greek Fathers, who solemnly swears that he "will never take nor *interpret* the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers!" But it is possible that he may keep his conscience tender by the ingenuity of the metaphysics of the Jesuit School. The Church believes

Digitized by Google

according to the unanimous consent; and by teaching what the Church or Bishop bids him, he saves both his conscience, his time, and his health from the self-immolation of reading in barbarous Latin 135 folios, or culling out of 135 bushels of chaff five grains of blighted wheat! What a blessed Jubilee when the seventh blast of the seventh trumpet of the seventh angel of mercy and of judgment shall scatter the last ashes of these 135 folios to the waters of oblivion! When Christians will read their Bibles, think for themselves, and worship God in spirit and in truth! A. C.

Neophyte's Department.

Amongst those who are occupied in the study of Christianity there are various degrees of proficiency, according to the amount of application bestowed, the opportunities enjoyed, and the capacity to receive instruction. The period, too, which may have elapsed since the individual entered the school of Christ, will, in most instances, make an important difference as well in knowledge and experience as in character. And as the point to which any one has attained in this heavenly science indicates the kind of instruction most suitable and best adapted to his circumstances and his proficiency, it is of much consequence that this precise species of instruction be afforded, and those subjects presented which are most likely to contribute to his improvement. Thus as we have Freshmen, and Sophs, and junior and senior classes in Colleges devoted to human sciences; so have we in Christianity and in the Church, "babes," "little children," "young men," and "fathers"—some who are far advanced in Christian learning, and others, who, though "for the time" they "ought to be teachers," are yet in a state of pupilage—some who may be exhorted to 'leave the first principles of the doctrine of Christ' with which they have become familiar, and others who, being unprepared to receive more difficult lessons, require such as are purely elementary.

Such being the case, it appears to me that not only should the churches pay special regard to this matter in their arrangements

Digitized by Google

for general edification, but that those periodicals which are devoted to the interests of primitive Christianity should devote a little space to the elucidation of such topics as will be interesting to the young converts who are constantly multiplying in number, as well as to the investigation of those subjects which are more remote and difficult.

As first principles of Christian doctrine, Paul enumerates faith, reformation, immersion, imposition of hands, the resurrection and eternal judgment, upon all which doubtless much may be said to pleasure and profit. And there are other matters also which are rather of a literary than of a religious nature, but which are yet of great importance, and indeed often absolutely necessary to be known in order to the proper understanding even of the elements of any science. Such are questions relating to language itself, which must be correctly understood before it can be a proper vehicle of thought; as the scaffolding must be firmly fixed before the building can be securely erected. Hence DEFINITION becomes necessary, and the rules of interpretation require to be considered. And hence the manners and customs of the ancients whose writings are the subject of examination; the authenticity and history of these books and manuscripts themselves; the history, chronology, and geography of the Old World; with many other items appertaining to the civil and religious polity, rites, and ceremonies of the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians, might with much advantage be treated of in connexion with the first principles of the gospel, for the purposes of illustration, explanation and confirmation.

Should this suggestion be approved, I will occasionally furnish brief remarks upon some of the above topics for the Millennial Harbinger: and for the present beg leave to take up the following subject:—

DEFINITION.

Definition relates to language, and the definition of a word is its meaning or signification. This may be either verbal or real; that is, we may define a new word or phrase either by other words or phrases which are familiar, or by presenting to the senses the thing which the word is intended to denote. Thus if the term *neophyte* be not understood, we endeavor to define it by stating that it has the same meaning as the more familiar phrase

Digitized by Google

'a new convert;' and this again may be explained by a direct application of it to the person so denominated. When, therefore, that for which a word stands cannot be presented to the senses, the word will admit of nothing but a verbal definition—we can only substitute another word with the form or sound of which we are better acquainted, but which we cannot possibly define or explain. Of this sort are the words infinity, eternity, angel, &c.

A word may have many different meanings—that is to say, may represent many different things or objects. This arises from the necessity of the case; for if we had separate words for all the things in the universe, memory would be unable to retain them. By the application of a single word, however, to many things, we are enabled to express in language the infinite variety of things which exist, although we have only thirty-eight thousand words. Hence it is absolutely necessary to a correct understanding of any writer or speaker that we should know the *exact sense* in which he wishes his words to be understood. The word *Score* in the English language signifies, 1. A note, or long incision. 2. A line drawn. 3. An account kept of something past. 4. Debt imputed. 5. Reason, motive. 6. Sake, account, reason referred to some thing. 7. Twenty. The written word *Bow* denotes, 1. An instrument of war. 2. A colored arch in the clouds. 3. The instrument with which stringed instruments are struck. 4. The doubling of a string in a slip-knot. 5. A yoke. 6. The fore part of a ship. 7. An act of reverence or submission. It is easy to perceive that words of so many different meanings may be readily misapplied and misunderstood, unless great care is taken in ascertaining the precise import attached to them by the person who uses them. Thus the student of the Bible would greatly err if he supposed the words Conference, General Assembly, Ambassador, Deacon, Priest, Bishop, with many others, to denote the same persons or things in the Scriptures, which they are used to signify in Disciplines, Confessions, and Prayer-books. Scriptural names may be given to unscriptural things, and vice may be clothed in the robes of virtue, in order to conceal deception or to delude to error. Thus Virgil says of the Queen of Carthage—

> *Conjugium vocat; hoc prætexit nomine culpam.*
> ÆN. L. iv. v. 172.
>
> She call'd it marriage; by that honor'd name
> To veil her error, and conceal her shame.

When we have it not in our power to explain a word which denotes some sensible object, by pointing to the object itself to which it refers, we endeavor to explain its meaning in other words by giving a short description of the object. Things may

Digitized by Google

be *described* by their qualities or attributes, their relations, uses, abuses, causes or effects. They are *distinguished* from each other, however, only by their peculiarities. If, in such a case, then, we inquire the meaning of a word, should we receive a false or imperfect description of that to which it relates, we may be involved in error and absurdity. A true definition embraces all the genuine characteristics of that which is defined, so as to admit of a just application. And at the same time it is neither so general and indefinite as to include more than belongs to the subject of definition, nor so precise that it will seldom or never apply. The definitions of the ancients are very deficient because they for the most part present a partial view of things. The moderns have perhaps more frequently erred in being too general. The joke put upon Plato on account of one of his imperfect definitions is famous. He, it seems, had defined man—"A two-footed animal without feathers." Upon which Diogenes the Cynic, a great derider of the Academics, threw a cock stripped of his feathers and quite naked, into the middle of Plato's school, crying, "Here is Plato's man!" Our Mr. Owen cannot plume himself upon his originality; for while he says nothing about feathers, it is obvious that his whole system is founded upon such a partial definition of man, as a mere animal undistinguished by intellectual endowments. The true meaning of the word *baptism*, on the other hand, is veiled by the generality of the modern definition, 'The use of water in a religious way;' which indeed is an *in*definition (if we may use such a word) rather than a definition, and will apply equally to the lustrations of the Hindoos, the ablutions of the Turks, and the immersion of Christians.

It is evident then that just definitions are of the utmost importance—and more especially in matters relating to religion. Indeed it is a truth worthy of special notice, that the present reformation from corrupt Christianity owes its origin and its success in a great measure, as a means, to a few correct definitions. It was the proper explanation of a few words, such as truth, fact, testimony, faith, repentance, baptism, gospel, church, &c. which unmasked the errors of the age, and presented to view the simple charms of primitive Christianity. And it is only by means of a true interpretation of language that any progress can be made in acquiring a just notion of the things which language is designed to teach. The banker who would not become a bankrupt, must know the exact value of all the coins offered at his desk. And he who would honestly enrich himself by the treasures of knowledge and understanding, must never allow himself to be cheated by taking words for more than they are worth; nor must he cheat others by taking them for less.

Having thus considered the nature, necessity, and importance

Digitized by Google

of definition, I may at a future time resume the subject. And I would esteem it likely to be of general utility if those who are competent to the task would furnish from time to time, for the special benefit of those who are beginning to learn Christianity, just and scriptural definitions of the leading words in the New Testament, as they may happen to occur. U

PROPHECY.

Mr. Editor,

I CANNOT but return my thanks to your worthy correspondent "D. A." for the very interesting letters which I have had the pleasure to receive from him through your pages. He has, indeed, in very appropriate and acceptable words, expressed his views both of what has been achieved and what is purposed in my humble efforts to save the credit of some of your brethren and the cause of reformation from the ultra literalisms of some of your glowing interpreters of prophecy. If I have only created doubts in their own minds of the soundness of their principles, and have, for the time being, turned their thoughts into other channels, and induced them to reconsider their speculations, although I may have rendered no other service, I trust that even this will be beneficial to them, and to the cause in which they are honestly and devoutly engaged. This, indeed, was my chief design and object.

Still I cannot regard the matter altogether as hopeless as your very judicious correspondent seems to represent it. I cannot altogether abandon the investigation of prophecy so long as it is written, 'Blessed are they who read and understand the things written in the prophetic books.' If we cannot tell the day, nor the hour, nor the precise spot in which certain great events are to transpire, still we may have so clear, full, and general views of the whole subject of prophecy, and of the signs of the times, as not materially to mistake on any great interest involving the expectations of the church.

I will endeavor to pursue a safe course; and if I fail in realizing my expectations in the unfulfilled prophecies, I think I may promise a more satisfactory view of those which have been accomplished. Meanwhile, the predictions concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, and the kingdoms antecedent to the Christian era, including some things on ancient geography and chronology, may furnish some entertainment to your readers, and some documentary assistance towards the development of the things which are coming upon the world.

I owe many apologies to yourself, sir, and your indulgent readers, for the procrastination with which I must have wearied your patience. I need not make the matter worse by now mending it with apologies. I have had many trials and interruptions, and lately I thought it good to wait the appearance of a new volume, and then to take a fresh start. I will make my essays short, and compensate in their brevity the absence of other merits.———Very courteously,

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Digitized by Google

THE PROPHECIES.—*NO. I.*

It is folly to presume to read the pages of the future if we have not mastered the history of the past. The chronicles of past times not only record what has transpired in the grand drama of human existence, but they also furnish data from which to understand the present and to anticipate the future. Familiarity with the things that were, and the things that are, is, therefore, essential to an acquaintance with the things that shall be. This is not more instructive to the politician than to the Christian; because, if in calculating the probabilities of the destinies of sceptres and of crowns, the politician must reason from the past; so, in unfolding the leaves of the prophetic volumes, the interpreter must not only first ascertain in what part of the page he now stands, and how many chapters have been fulfilled, but the language, the style, and the image under which the future is portrayed can only be understood by the expositions and illuminations which history affords.

The beloved Daniel himself, gifted as he was with heavenly visions and interpretations, "*understood by books the number of the years*"—"of the desolations of Jerusalem." Without the books of the historians of Israel the books of their Prophets would have been forever sealed to the wisest of the wise, unless the spirit of prophecy had become the spirit of history, and revealed the past as well as the future. But this would have been offering a premium to indolence and sloth, contrary to the economy of the Universal Father, whose wisdom it is to reveal only what could not otherwise be known.

Our plan then shall be, first, to study the style and imagery of the Revealing Spirit by examining the prophecies fulfilled and fulfilling, and as soon as we have acquired a due degree of confidence in applying the predictions which are now turned into history, we shall next attempt the exposition of those in the immediate future, and so proceed to the more remote.

The Bible is so contrived by its Divine Author as to connect the history of all the empires of the world with the history of a single family, whose register was kept for 4000 years with the greatest fidelity and care, and by which we can now ascend through all the generations of men up to the common progenitors of our race. From the Jews now living we ascend to Judah, to Abraham, to Shem, to Seth, to Adam. Around the shattered fortunes of this old tree we see entwined the destiny of every nation, tribe, and language under heaven. As the mantled oak sustains and exhibits to the eye of the passenger the ivy that clings to it, by whose umbrageous foliage its leaves are almost concealed, so this old olive tree of Israel is almost covered with the

Digitized by Google

fortunes not only of the past empires of ancient times, and of surrounding and contemporaneous nations of the present day, but also with the ultimate and glorious destiny of all future nations that shall arise from the changes and revolutions now in progress.

This fact greatly simplifies the study of prophecy, and therefore ought to have that conspicuity in our researches and inquiries which it has on the sacred page. To demonstrate its importance at this time would be only to anticipate much of what will be better said in connexion with the prophecies of the book of Genesis. To these we shall first invite the attention of the curious and inquisitive.

Prophecy I.—Gen. iii. 14, 15. "And the Lord God said to the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field. Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it [or he] shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel."

This has been regarded sometimes as a threatening, sometimes as a promise, and sometimes as a prophecy. It is, indeed, all three; but its being the first or the second by no means forbids its being the third. As respects the object addressed, it was a threatening; as respects the woman and her race, it was a promise of good; and, as respects the destiny of our race, or the purposes of God towards human kind, it is a prophecy of the most sublime import.

A literal serpent was the instrument of seduction; the degradation of the animal to crawl on its belly, was literal. Its eating the dust is also literal: and the literal descendants of the woman are inclined to this day literally to bruise its head, though it cannot be said to do more than occasion the bruising of the heel that treads upon it. Persons are not accustomed to place their naked heel upon the head of a serpent, still in killing it they occasionally bruise the heel.

But that Satan was the actor, and the serpent the instrument, cannot be doubted; and therefore the name of the instrument has been fixed upon him. So Paul would teach, (2 Cor. xi. 3.) "I fear lest, by any means, as the *Serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty*, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."—"That *old Serpent*," (says John in Revel. xii. 9.) "called the Devil and Satan, which deceived the whole world." Thus we are taught that Satan and the Serpent become two names for an agent opposed to the church; and thus the distinguishing attributes and marks of the literal serpent are figuratively applied to the Devil and Satan.

Various figures originate from this occurrence; such as, "lick the dust," Psalm lxxii. 9.; and "dust shall be the serpent's meat," Is. lxv.

Digitized by Google

25.; and "the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet soon," Rom. xvi.; "the nations shall lick the dust like a serpent: they shall move out of their holes like the reptiles of the earth," Micah vi. 17.; "the seed of the serpent;" "you are of your father the Devil," &c.

Three things are foretold in this threatening:—

1. That there should be a fixed and constant enmity between the two seeds—that of the serpent and that of the woman.

2. That the seed of the serpent would partially injure and grieve the seed of the woman. "Thou shalt bruise *his* heel."

3. But that the seed of the woman should finally completely destroy the serpent. "He shall bruise thy head."

The first prophecy, and the oldest in the world, is, therefore, *figurative* as respects its most important application; while it literally applies, and was literally verified in reference to the original events that called it forth. This double application, sometimes called a "double sense" of prophecy, appears to have been as ancient as prophecy itself; for while all the prominent items in some prophecies exactly apply to the case which elicited them, they are made to have a bearing as exact upon that great theme to which the spirit of all prophecy points, and in which all its rays concentrate.

It is not said that the serpent should eat only dust, and therefore we find it lives on various animals, in eating which, from its posture, it is constrained to eat the dust. But as this betokens its degradation, it is selected as best adapted to express its doom. From this and the intimation of bruising the heel, which, in killing the serpent is by no means general, we may learn that there are the major and minor points in all parables, comparisons, and prophecies, which are not to be equally forced to an exact interpretation by a too rigid application. True, indeed, that in the prophetic and ultimate application of this threatening, the seed of the woman lost his earthly life in vanquishing the serpent, which he mainly did when on the cross he triumphed over principalities and powers, and destroyed him whose mortal bite brought death into the world and all our woe.

NOAH'S PROPHECY.

Prophecy II.—Genesis ix. 25, 26, 27. "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant."

Here are briefly sketched by the hand of that Spirit by which Noah preached to the disobedient antediluvians, the fortunes of the three branches of Noah's family.

Digitized by Google

The Canaanites are subjected to their brethren for the ingratitude of their father Ham. The future enlargement of Japheth who appears to have been more fruitful than his brethren, and the peculiar blessings of Shem, or of the Lord God of Shem, are unequivocally expressed.

What pertains to Shem most of all interests us. Who, then, is the Lord God of Shem? Is he not the Lord God of Japheth also! It would seem as if there was already in contemplation or in prospect a peculiar intimacy or relation between the Lord and Shem unknown to the other branches of this family. The sacred dialect may perhaps authorize us to regard this as one of the titles of the Messiah. Suppose the phrase had been "Blessed be the Lord God of David," would we not have been constrained to regard it as a designation of David's Son!—"The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand." How can he be "David's Son" and "David's Lord!" Just as he could be the son of Shem and the Lord God of Shem. The Messiah himself confounded his captious contemporaries with such a question, and showed that in the sacred style it was possible to be both the *root* and the *offspring* of David—the Son and the Lord of David; consequently the Son and Lord of Shem—from whom, as from David, the Messiah was a branch, as well as the root of them all.

There is nothing in this prediction difficult. There is no figure, unless we find it in the "Lord God of Shem," or in the "tents of Shem;" and they appear to be both easy of interpretation.

The subjugation of the Canaanites 800 years after the flood, to Shem, was as clearly fulfilled as it was foretold. The enlargement of Japheth, first by Scythia, and afterwards by America, is as clearly accomplished as it has been spoken. The blessings accruing from the Lord of Shem, or the Messiah, to the human race, is no matter of doubtful interpretation; and that the people of Japheth are truly dwelling in the tents of Shem and partaking of the good things inherited by Shem, is just as plain as either of the other items foretold: so that not only the unadorned style of the oracle itself, but the exact accomplishment of its provisions, show that there are plain and literal, as well as figurative predictions.

It might, perhaps, be expedient here to state that these predictions respect not all the individuals of any of these branches; for it is of them as a *people*, or peoples, and not as the individual sons of Noah, these things are spoken. Hence we find amongst the descendants of Ham, the renowned Melchisedec King of Salem and Priest of the Most High God, and the virtuous Abimelech, the pious King of Egypt; while in the posterity of Shem there are numerous reprobates of the most attrocious character, as the history of the Jews alone too amply testifies.

Digitized by Google

We will only add, that while the first prophecy intimates that the SEED of the woman, *the Virgin's Son*, was to be a *triumphant victor*, the second assures us that he was to be a *Divine person*. "Blessed be the Lord the God of Shem," and let all the children of Noah do him homage!

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

THINGS NEW AND OLD.

Mr. Editor,

THE enclosed manuscript was put into my hands a few days since by a particular acquaintance, whom I shall at present designate by the letter L. He stoutly maintains that he, being a young man, has as good a right to see visions, as his seniors, the literalists, have to fulfil prophecy by dreaming dreams while they are endeavoring to explain it. If you think it will be of service to others, it is at yours.

E

A VISION OF THE PAST.

INTRODUCTION.

CALLING to see my friend Dr. G. the other evening, I found that he was absent upon a professional visit to a poor widow five miles in the country. Upon further inquiry I learned that this unfortunate woman had been left, by the death of her husband, in poor circumstances, with several small children. She struggled, however, to earn, by her wheel and occasional jobs of work, a scanty support, until about four weeks since, when she was taken ill with an affection of the chest, by which she was now confined to bed. Her dwelling-place is an open log-cabin in the woods upon the outskirts of a farm belonging to one of her rich neighbors. During her long-continued sickness, little or no attention, I was informed, had been paid to her by the neighbors; and her only nurse, by night or by day, was her little daughter, about eight years of age, upon whom she had to depend for all the little comforts she enjoyed, and even for the giving of her medicine.

Digitized by Google

I could not but feel affected by this recital, upon reflecting that the fitful blasts of cold December were keeping their melancholy vigils around the couch of the widow and her orphans instead of human Sympathy and Affection. Nor was I less surprised at the neglect she suffered, upon hearing that her neighbors had had the address to accomplish the difficult task of uniting the service of God and Mammon, and had succeeded in combining with much of this world's goods, a very large portion of religion.

But, thought I to myself, when, upon my return home, I threw myself into my easy chair and trimmed my little fire, can this be really religion? Or is it possible that this can be the religion of the Bible? This, I exclaimed, may be after all a species of religion; yet as I thought of that beautiful scripture, "Pure religion, and undefiled, with God, even the Father, is this: To take care of orphans and widows in their affliction and to keep one's self unspotted from the world," I added with emphasis, This is *not* the religion of the Bible.

What then! said I, (I love to talk to myself about religion, for I am then in little danger of getting into a quarrel, and I detest all quarrels, let them be ever so *religious*,) have men committed a mistake in supposing that true religion consists in those peculiar forms and modes of worship which they so carefully observe, or in the passionate zeal with which they contend for them? And if the various manners and customs, modes and ceremonies, called religious, do not really constitute that religion which is acceptable to God, what is the use of them, and by what rule is their value to be ascertained?

On the one hand, we have those who glory in the convenience of written prayers and responses by which they are enabled to know their wants without the trouble of feeling them; or those who delight in the vehemence of extempore prayers and involuntary exclamations and responses by which alone they can attain to a feeling of what they do not know. On the other hand, we have those who love expressive silence, and the sublimated emotions of a mysterious, abstract, and uncertain spiritualism which disdains all external form, or is of too ethereal a nature to be embodied. Here we have love-feasts, at which each

Digitized by Google

member partakes of a loaf of bread and a cup of water; and there fasts of forty days, which are kept most religiously upon fish. Here we have a song converted into a sermon, and there a sermon converted into a song. In a word, we have every variety of form and spirit; of rites and ceremonies; of manners and customs; of opinions and practices, sustained by the most ardent zeal, and regarded as the very essence of religion.

Yet what are these to true religion, but as the *regalia* to the monarch; the canvass to the painting; the body to the spirit; the means to the end? And what better standard can we have by which to ascertain their comparative merits than their adaptation to the purposes for which they were instituted, and their influence in promoting the proper objects of religion? A form without a spirit is but a cold and lifeless statue; while a spirit without a form is but a church-yard spectre. That system must certainly be the best which accomplishes the best purposes; and all forms of religion are equally valueless if they are esteemed its *beau-ideal*. The form is created for the religion; not the religion for its form. Yet as a perfect body is necessary to the perfect action of the soul, and even to its reception; so a complete and suitable system is necessary to display fully the excellencies of religion.

Why then, said I, can we not have the true form of religion and the true religion also? Why should men deceive themselves any longer with imperfect systems? Why should one party content themselves with one or two of the ordinances of ancient Christianity: another with a few of its doctrines: a third with the primitive zeal: a fourth with the ancient simplicity of dress and manners? Why not unite the various parts of the Christian system, so as to form a fit abode for that true and undefiled religion which seems to have been the spirit and genius of ancient Christianity?

Oh! could I see unveiled the perfect, heaven-born religion of the apostolic age, how different it would probably be from all that now bears the name of Christianity! Could I witness the simple customs; the purity of behaviour; the love; the zeal; the joy; the good works, by which the first converts are said to have been characterized, how singular might be the contrast with the corruptions of a degenerate and apostate age!

Digitized by Google

Upon this, I fell into a reverie, and influenced by a strong desire to know what was really the state of things in the beginning, I could not but wish that it were possible to leap over the chasm which separated me from ancient scenes; or that I could obtain "through the dark postern of time long elapsed" even a glimpse of things that were. In the midst of my cogitations and conjectures———but this belongs to another chapter.

L

"CLEAVELAND LIBERALIST."

DR. UNDERHILL, of whom some notice was taken in the last volume of the preceding series, is now editing a periodical under the above caption. He has very frequently alluded to my lectures on the evidences of the Christian religion in my late visit to Cleaveland, and pretends to take some notice of my speeches and positions in the numbers which I have seen. The Doctor is determined to *enlighten* the world and rescue mankind from the dominion of the Bible by the discoveries of *Thomas Paine* and the corruscations and fulminations of *Robert Taylor* of Oakham memory! To promulge these theories he lectures and writes with the zeal of a missionary.

I have glanced at his allusions to the discussion of the Evidences, and see nothing in them but the proof that his memory, as well as his understanding, is by no means extraordinary. No person who has heard me deliver one lecture on that subject, or read any thing I have written on the Christian religion, can for a moment imagine that the Doctor has fairly represented or met one of my arguments on the authenticity and inspiration of the Bible. So leaky is his memory that he let one thousand years pass through a single chasm on the subject of the antiquity of the manuscript copies of the Living Oracles. He represents me as conceding that there was no manuscript older than "*four hundred years*," instead of *fourteen hundred*. This, however, with the Doctor is a small trifle. Equally, though not to all persons so evidently erroneous, are his statements of propositions and proofs. The "*Liberalist*" is so *free* from the restraints of

Digitized by Google

matter of fact, and the obligations of Christianity, that he cannot be circumscribed by things as they are, or were. His imagination is too strong for both memory and understanding, so that he is evidently better qualified for writing a heroic poem than for either stating or rebutting a serious argument on any serious subject.

There is an inflated swaggering and boasting in the ranks of Atheists, most disgusting to all men of sense. While in New York last August, I happened to notice an advertisement of 1000 dollars for a refutation of "The System of Nature, written by Baron D'Holbach;" formerly called "Mirabeau's System of Nature." This advertisement was from the firm of G. W. & A. J. Matsell, Chatham street, the publishers of said volume. Believing it to be a snare for the unwary—a stratagem to expedite the sale of D'Holbach—I called on the publishers to know how this premium was to be adjudicated; assuring them that if they would satisfy me on the subject of the tribunal and of their willingness and ability to pay the sum, I should find a refutation of the Baron's speculations. But of all this I could get no satisfaction. They promised to reflect and write to me on the subject; but hitherto I have not heard from them one word. These gentlemen keep a store for vending infidel books, and are said to do a large business in that way. By such slippery tricks the infidel press is sustained, and the ignorant and unwary are duped to perdition.

Dr. Underhill's allusions to my speeches and his quotations and reflections are in the spirit of the one thousand dollars premium for the refutation of the Baron's System of Nature; raised upon assumption, and proved by hypothesis from beginning to end. The radical difference between these systems and ours can be expressed in one period—*Theirs is hypothesis against fact, and ours is fact against hypothesis.* Infidelity is hypothesis in proof of hypothesis; while the Christian religion opposes to the visionary and romantic speculations of hypothetical schemes an array of moral facts and documents of the most unequivocal authenticity, and of the most majestic power in enlarging the mind and elevating the character and condition of mankind. Hence Dr. Underhill will as soon beat into powder the rock of Gibraltar, by a mallet of cork-wood, as refute a single argument

Digitized by Google

or fact which any man of sense has ever offered in behalf of the Christian religion. A. C.

EXCOMMUNICATION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

THE following paragraphs form a part of the "Damnation and Excommunication of Elizabeth, Queen of England, and her adherents," by Pope Pius in the year 1570.

"PIUS, FOR A PERPETUAL MEMORIAL OF THE MATTER.

"I. He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, committed one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone upon earth, to Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made Prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may retain the faithful, that are knit together with the band of charity, in the unity of the Spirit, and present them spotless and unblamable to their Saviour. In discharge of which function, we who are, by God's goodness, called to the government of the aforesaid church, spare no pains, laboring with all earnestness, that unity and the religion, which the author thereof hath for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be exercised with so great afflictions, might be preserved uncorrupted.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

"IV. Being, therefore, supported with his authority, whose pleasure it was to place us, though unequal to so great a burden, in this supreme throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favorer of heretics, and her adherents in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever: and also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by the authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things aforesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her admonitions, mandates, and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of anathema."

Digitized by Google

Sketches of Religious History.

As it will doubtless be interesting and profitable to our readers to be acquainted with the existing state of the religious world, we will endeavor to furnish occasionally a synopsis of its various divisions, and note such changes and events as are deserving of attention.

As introductory to this subject, we present the following general account of the religions of the world, from Malte-Brun;—premising that all Religion may be arranged under two grand divisions—POLYTHEISM and MONOTHEISM. *Polytheism* includes a great many varieties of religious belief and worship. *Monotheism*, however, may be conveniently subdivided into JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, and MAHOMETANISM.

POLYTHEISM.

"The name of *Polytheism* is given to every system of religion which admits the existence of several gods, whatever be the nature and dignity which it assigns to them. Of this there are several kinds. The grossest of all is *Fetichism*, or the adoration of Fetiches. By Fetiche, is understood all sorts of animated or inanimate substances, which the priests of these religions hold out to the savages as beings that are enchanted or endowed with some magical and divine power. These absurd superstitions prevail among the ignorant nations of the coast of Guinea, and among a great many other savages.

"*Sabeism* holds a more elevated rank, that is to say, the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun, the moon, and the stars, either separately, or altogether. This very ancient system, spread over the whole extent of the globe, is blended with all the other systems of superstition. But it no longer exists entirely pure, except among some insulated tribes. It has its name from the Sabeans, or Sabians, an ancient people of Arabia.

"Pantheism, modified by the institutions of particular nations, and blending itself with Sabeism, became systematic, or mythological *Polytheism*. Under this name may be classed all those schemes of religious belief, in which the attributes of the Deity are personated as separate divine beings. These systems, then, are barbarous and irrational. They are, however, well suited for poetry and the fine arts, and have been received among the most civilized nations of antiquity.—Among other nations, such as the Syrians, the Chaldeans, and the Phenicians, the worship of the stars and the physical energies of the earth, appears to have predominated.

Digitized by Google

"In the religion of the *Bramins*, the Supreme Being is supposed to be disguised under different forms, divine, human, and animal. We think that this belief might be considered as the source of all the others, even of Fetichism; but it might be equally asserted that the religion of the Bramins is merely ennobled Fetichism. *Theomorphism*, the religion of the Hindoos, is the best supported of all the ancient systems of worship; it still exists. Two of its branches prevail in the North and East of Asia. The one is *Schamanism*, the head of which is the *Dalai Lama*, a priest who is supposed never to die. This religion, mixed with Fetichism, is spread over Tartary, Mongolia, and Siberia; the other branch is *Buddism*, or the *Braminic* system reformed by Budda, named also Somonocodom. It is established among the Bramins in Siam and in Ceylon. The ancient religion of Japan is a kind of Schamanism, at the side of which has arisen the religion of *Fo*, which is that of the multitude in China, and which is only a degenerate branch of that of Budda; the priests are called *Bonzes*."

MONOTHEISM.

"*Judaism* is now divided into two principal sects—namely, that of the Karaites, who acknowledge as divine only the books of the Old Testament; and that of the Rabbinists, who attribute an authority almost divine to the collection known under the name of the Talmud.

"*Christianity*, for the introduction of which the Jewish scriptures and the Jewish polity paved the way, sprung up in the bosom of Judaism, and although in consequence of corrupting its pure doctrines, by mingling with them the principles of the Platonic philosophy, and encumbering its few and simple rites by the inventions of human fancy, it became soon divided into an infinity of sects and systems, it now sheds its benignant and liberal influence over the most civilized countries, and in all quarters of the world.

"The Greek or Eastern Church, which most nearly resembles the Christianity of the fifth and sixth centuries, is tolerated in Turkey, countenanced in Hungary, Sclavonia, and Dalmatia, and established by law in Russia. Among its various branches we may distinguish the *Nestorians* in Turkey in Asia, who at one time were very numerous in Tartary, in Mongolia, and even in China; and the *Monophysites*, who comprehend the Copts in Egypt, the Abyssinians, the Armenians and the Jacobites.

"The Latin or Western Church is divided into two great parties.

"The *Catholic*, Apostolic, or Romish Church, comprehends within its pale the greater part of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, the extensive Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America, Africa, and Asia, and three-fourths of the population of Ire-

Digitized by Google

land. The *Pope* is the spiritual head. The Gallican Church is distinguished by privileges peculiar to itself, which oppose an invincible barrier to the usurpations of the Pope. The United Greeks, who forsook the communion of the Oriental Greek Church, form an inconsiderable appendage to the Catholic Church.

"The *Protestant* Churches are divided into three branches: *Lutheranism*, or the Evangelical Church, is supported by the state in Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Livonia; *Calvinism*, or the Reformed Church, is most prevalent in Switzerland, in some countries of Germany, and in Holland; it is the established religion in Scotland, under the name of the Presbyterian Church. We may identify with the reformed church, the *Independents*, or *Congregationalists*, who are so numerous in the United States that they have more than 1000 congregations. The English, or Episcopal Church, is distinguished from the other Protestant denominations merely by its maintaining the order of the episcopal hierarchy. It is the established religion in England; and in Ireland, although the faith of the minority, it is upheld by the strong hand of power.—The other principal denominations are: The *Unitarians*, *Socinians*, or *Antitrinitarians*, whose opinions are protected in Transylvania and in Russian Poland;—the *Arminians*, or Remonstrants, a party which sprung up in Holland, and who differ from the Calvinists in the opinions which they hold concerning the doctrines commonly called the five points;—the *Mennonites*, at first known by the name of Anabaptists, and disgraced on account of their fanatical excesses, but now the most peaceable of all the sects;—the *Baptists*, a numerous party in [Europe and] America;—the United *Moravian Brethren*, or Hernhutters, a sort of monastic institution, who, in other respects adopt the tenets of Lutheranism, and who carry together the blessings of religion and the useful arts into the remotest and most savage tribes;—the *Quakers*, or Tremblers, numerous both in America and England;—the *Shakers*, the *Dunkers*, and other associations similar to the Quakers;—the *Swedenborgians*, or the followers of the Baron Swedenborg, a sect of mystics to be met with in Sweden and England;—lastly, the *Methodists*, who are very numerous in England, and still more so in the United States.

"Christianity, besides all the enemies which have sprung from its bosom, has seen arise close by its side a rival at first dangerous, and still troublesome, in *Mahometanism*, or, according to the manner in which Mahometans themselves speak of it, *Islamism*, that is, the Orthodox church. This religion is merely a confused mixture of Judaism and Christianity, with some poetical ornaments. The Mahometan creed prevails in the greater part of Asia and Africa, as well as in Turkey in Europe,

Digitized by Google

and it is tolerated in Russia. Mahometanism comprehends several sects. The *Sunnites*, although divided with regard to discipline into four parties, agree in reckoning the book of traditions, or the Sunna, in the number of their sacred writings, and in considering Omar and his successors the legitimate Califs. This party is the most numerous: the Turks belong to it.

"The name of *Schiites* means Separatists. The Sunnites give it to all those who differ from them; they reckon six classes, each split into twelve subdivisions, which make 72 heretical sects; for the Turks have thought, like Bossuet, that the multiplicity of heretics furnishes a plausible objection to their doctrines. But in truth, there is only one considerable party among the Schiites, that of the followers of Ali, who reject the Sunna: their creed is dominant in Persia.

"It is difficult to speak with precision as to the number of followers belonging to each religion actually existing in the world—a misplaced zeal leads the different parties to exaggerate their numbers, as if there were no truth in Seneca's observation, that a great majority often indicates a bad cause. Infidel writers in particular have thought they were rendering an important service to their cause, by ridiculously exaggerating the numbers of Mahometans and Pagans, not considering that truth will be always truth, whether it be believed by many or by few.

"The following numbers may be regarded as nearly approaching the truth:—

"*Catholicism*, { In Europe, 88,000,000 / out of Europe, 28,000,000 }		116,000,000
The Greek Church,		70,000,000
The Protestant Churches, &c.		42,000,000
Total of *Christians*,		228,000,000
Judaism,	4 to	5,000,000
Mahometanism,	100	110,000,000
Braminism,		60,000,000
Schamanism, or the religion of Dalai Lama,		50,000,000
Buddism, comprising the religion of Fo, &c.		100,000,000
Fetichism, and various other beliefs,		100,000,000"

News from the Churches.

RANDOLPH COUNTY, *Indiana*, October 16, 1836.

FOR twenty years has sectarianism in different forms been trying to make an impression here, but to no effect. Four of us, who had obeyed the gospel and renounced tradition, lived for some years as lost sheep, till brother John L. Jones visited us last May. He preached three days, and immersed five persons. We then numbered nine, and concluded to meet every first day of the week, break bread, and exhort each other to love and good works. On the 5th and 6th of September, brother Tie-

Digitized by Google

field and brother Martindale immersed six: this gave us great courage. On the 16th of September brother Jones returned, and in the course of five days immersed fourteen persons, two of whom are veterans of '76, who had been desperately wicked all their former life, but have now concluded to learn war no more, and to wend their way to a better world. My eyes never dwelt on so enrapturing a scene as when I saw four out of one family, consisting of an elderly man, (who had formerly been a Presbyterian deacon,) his wife, (of the same church,) his granddaughter, and his uncle, a veteran of '76, in the 79th year of his age, all obey the gospel at the same time. Persecution from the sects ran high, but is abating. We now number thirty-one, (two being added by letter,) and have happy prospects. We have solemnly agreed to take the New Testament for our rule, faith, and guide, and to renounce all traditions of men whatever. Will some of our travelling brethren lend us their aid?

GEORGE W. SMITH.

BAGDAD, *Smith County, Tenn.* September 4, 1836.

We have a church organized at this place of near one hundred members. A few of us meet every Lord's day to show forth the Lord's death till he come. We have appointed Elders and Deacons to attend to the affairs of the church; but we are very much at a loss for proclaimers. There are three churches or places of meeting for worship in this county, and convenient to each other—to wit: Salt Lick, Bagdad, and Snow Creek, without a public proclaimer—our Elders being inexperienced in public speaking, though old in years. Brother Samuel Dewhit and brother Bomar have attended to us until of late. The former is now about to remove to Illinois, and the latter has moved near Nashville; and at this time we know not from whence we are to be supplied. We are in possession of the good Book to direct our course to heaven. We have a good many hands, but we lack the skill, and perhaps the zeal which is necessary to build up the house of God. If some of the churches or neighborhoods where the preaching brethren are plenty, would send us a good and an able one, I think the prospect is good for him to be useful here, and the church to be useful to him. Either a young man who would travel and preach, or a man of a family who would settle among us and preach occasionally, would do. But I fear that unless some man or men fit for the task will come to our assistance, that the above named churches, or members of the church at the above named places, will decrease instead of increasing; not because we have not a good cause or do not understand the right way, but because we need some person to stir us up to put in execution what we have learned, and to encourage us to persevere through persecution. For the orthodox of the day say many hard things against our belief and plan of worship. But we have reason to thank Almighty God that the ancient order of things is still spreading its influence where it has become known, and is gaining strength where it has been preached.

JAMES YOUNG.

BUCYRUS, *Ohio*, October 26, 1836.

On the 2d September, I attended a meeting for co-operation in Wayne county. Eighteen were immersed during the meeting, and one added from the Baptists, I think. On the 10th, 11th, and 12th, brethren J. Porter, G. W. Lucy, and myself attended in Millersburg, Holmes

Digitized by Google

county; during which time eight were immersed, and one in the week previous, making twenty-five in all. Then, including Lord's day (25th) attended a four-days' meeting in Knox county; some weeks previous to which, public invitation had been given in different places for any or all who oppose us, to appear by their speakers; and that, under proper regulations, they should occupy half the time; while we would with them enter into a patient and candid investigation of at least some of the chief points of difference. None, however, deigned to attend, or at least none made themselves known. We, therefore, occupied the time ourselves, as well as we could, to satisfy the public mind. Three were immersed at that meeting. October 1, 2, and 3, at brother Garrett's, Holmes county, five were there immersed; then, 8th and 9th, at Hugh Funk's, Wayne county, five immersed; on the 15th and 16th at Sepley's, Knox county, one immersed. Add to these several immersed at meetings that I have not attended, and we have an increase of about forty-five in this region within two months. Opposition, if not receding, is less bold; and I think there is a growing interest observable on the part of many of the disciples. Now with all this before me, I may perhaps safely say, that truth is gaining in its enlightening and redeeming influence on the public mind in our section of the state. Praised be the Lord!

BENJN. SANDERS.

TUSCUMBIA, *Ala.* October 22, 1836.

Since our severance from the Baptist sect (more than two years since) the brethren here have lived in great harmony and peace, and have found much comfort and advantage in attending to the Apostles' admonition of not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together. We have suffered some little inconvenience for want of a suitable house to meet in, which, however, is in a fair way of being remedied; having been repeatedly ejected from the houses of public worship, both in the town and country, the citizens of the place, with a praiseworthy liberality, have voluntarily subscribed a very handsome sum, which will enable us to have a house of our own. We number at present about twenty-seven, though we have suffered the loss of several by death and removals from our congregation. During the last six months I have immersed four for the remission of sins.

WM. H. WHARTON.

TUSCALOOSA, *Ala.* November 2, 1836.

Thirty have said, "Let there be light," in this place and vicinity, within a few weeks. The ice of sectarianism and orthodoxy is at last, in this part, broken. "The Word of the Lord is as fire, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces; and surely, too, the Lord is against *false* Prophets." Jer. xxii.

JAS. A. BUTLER.

HOME, *Ky.* November 1, 1836.

Last night I returned from a trip to New Liberty again. Brother G. W. Elley accompanied me. He is a most amiable Christian, and an able and efficient evangelist. We had most interesting meetings, and succeeded in getting ten persons to submit to the one Lord, one faith, &c., while we were all overwhelmed with joy and thanksgiving to God for the matchless conquests of the truth. The prospects there are as favorable as ever. This place is about 14 miles from Warsaw.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Digitized by Google

EAGLEVILLE, *Ohio*, November 21, 1836.

The good cause is slowly progressing among us. I have not the pleasure to inform you that hundreds have been immersed; but that the little band (but seven in number at our first formation) has increased to more than fifty. During the past season I immersed three of the most intelligent persons in our community.

E. A. MILLS.

NOTTINGHAM, Harrison county, *Ohio*, November 21, 1836.

I hasten to inform you that *nine* have obeyed the gospel of the Son of God in this place since I last wrote you. The prospect still continues good. On the 8th instant I organized a new congregation 8 miles west of Coshocton, of about thirty members, and assisted in ordaining two deacons. *This* congregation bids fair to do well. In the various places where I have visited of late, the disciples are exerting a much greater influence on the community than heretofore.

ROBERT COOK.

ADAMS COUNTY, *Illinois*, November 27, 1836.

On Wednesday night, 13th instant, at a meeting held at my house, one who had formerly been a Deist came forward and confessed his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Brother Rigdon came on the next day and labored among us until the close of the ensuing Lord's day, during which time ten others made the good confession; and on Tuesday the 15th I attended a meeting at brother R. Seaton's, where two more came forward. I on that day immersed ten: the rest will be immersed we hope next Lord's day, being to-morrow; at which time I expect more to unite with us. May the good Lord in his providence break down every obstruction that stands in the way of truth, that this wilderness country may rejoice under the sceptre of King Jesus!

JOHN B. CURL.

FAYETTE COUNTY, *Illinois*, November 18, 1836.

At a three days' meeting, held with the disciples in Bond county, on the last days of October, we had quite a refreshing season: several individuals were added to the church from the neighboring sects; among the number a licensed Cumberland Preacher, a man of good standing and of acknowledged piety. Also, at a previous meeting several were received by a profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus, and immersion. We had the labors of brethren B. F. Chastine and Drennin, of Macaupin county, who informed me that there was in their vicinity a large congregation of disciples.

S. P. GORIN.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, *Kentucky*, November 26, 1836.

Brother S. Helms and myself, by the request of the churches, have been engaged in proclaiming the glad tidings for two months past, being assisted occasionally by brethren Carpenter and Swiney. Twenty-five have made the good confession—the majority of them in Jefferson county, on Farm Creek, where the prospect is good for more. May the Lord continue to be with us!

B. ALLEN.

COBOURG, *Upper Canada*, November 8, 1836.

There is a wide door open in these parts for the reception of the ancient gospel, could it be proclaimed by able, pious, and discreet men.

JOSEPH ASH, JUN.

Digitized by Google

POETRY.

OUR COMMON MOTHER.

When art thou fairest, Nature? When her hood
Pale Twilight dons, and o'er the quiet vale
Fares forth, to hear within the silent wood
The plaintive story of the nightingale;
And, in the dim and drowsy light of eve,
The spider loves its subtle snare to weave.

Or art thou fairest in the morning hour,
When day-light dances on the daisied lea;
When birds sing forth their matins from the bower,
And blossom-banners float from every tree:
When sunshine sparkles from the stream, and all
The jocund earth seems one bright festal hall?

Nay, thou art ever fair! in every mood,
Through every season, and at every hour!
'Tis but the heart where sinful thoughts intrude,
That doubts thy beauty, and rejects thy power:
Why—why should evil mingle with our blood,
Since only they are happy who are good?

Thine is a glorious volume, Nature! each
Line, leaf, and page are filled with living lore;
Wisdom more pure than sage could ever teach,
And all philosophy's divinest store:
Rich lessons rise where'er thy tracks are trod—
The book of Nature is the book of God.

For. Journ.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

[Under this head, it is our design to offer a few brief remarks, as opportunity offers, upon such publications as are likely to affect the moral and religious interests of society. Those periodicals which are devoted to the restoration of Primitive Christianity deserve and will receive especial attention. Works relating to education, useful literature, and general science, will also receive some notice.]

The Philosophy of Benevolence—by Pharcellus Church, M. A.—Rochester, N. Y.—1836. Such is the title of a neatly executed duodecimo volume of 356 pages, which has for its object the settlement of the principles by which benevolence is to be regulated.

This performance is certainly highly creditable to the author, with whom we had the pleasure of forming an acquaintance in Rochester. Some objectionable matters there are in it, among which may be mentioned remarks and illustrations favoring the unscriptural opinions and plans of operation which have obtained in the religious community. These

Digitized by Google

doubtless may be attributed to the circumstances which have surrounded the writer. The subject, however, is ably handled, and the motives and inducements to an entire consecration to the service of God presented in a forcible manner. The style is clear and perspicuous, and the illustrations are happy. It is a work which is likely to promote objects of the greatest importance to the community, and by the perusal of which every one will be benefitted. "When," says Labruyere, "we are elevated with reading a work; and the mind is inspired with noble and generous sentiments, we need seek no other rule to judge it by. It is good, and done by a masterly hand."

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN & INVESTIGATOR—a monthly publication, of 24 duodecimo pages, edited by S. Shepard, Auburn, New York. This well-conducted periodical exerts a good influence. Its publication will be continued as usual, as we perceive by the December number.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE—Published monthly, 24 pages 12mo.—edited by B. F. Hall and J. T. Johnson. This periodical is henceforth to be printed at Versailles, Ky, under the title of *The Christian Panoplist*, and under the auspices of B. F. Hall, one of its former editors, and Wm. Hunter, late of the Investigator.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE—24 pages, 12mo., monthly—edited by John Thomas, M. D. This work, lately published in Richmond, is removed to the neighborhood of Painesville, Amelia county, Va.

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLISHER—edited by R. L. Coleman, 24 pages, 12mo., monthly, Charlottesville, Va. From the spirit and ability manifested in the first numbers of this periodical, it bids fair to be extremely useful at the present crisis.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER—24 pages, 12mo. monthly, Jacksonville, Ill. This work is still conducted by Elder B. W. Stone, with his accustomed liberality, ability, and good feeling.

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER—36 pages, large 12mo., monthly, edited by J. R. Howard. This publication is about being removed to Nashville, Tenn.

THE DISCIPLE—24 pages, 8vo., monthly, conducted by J. A. Butler & A. Graham, Tuscaloosa, Ala. This work has exerted a good influence in Alabama, and is continued as formerly.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER AND VOLUNTARY CHURCH ADVOCATE, conducted by Wm. Jones, M. A., author of the History of the Waldenses, &c., 48 pages, 12mo., monthly. The publication of this able work has been suspended at the end of the 2d volume on account of the increasing age of its venerable editor, and his desire to prepare for the press a volume of sermons upon some important topics. There is some expectation of its being subsequently resumed.

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER, consisting of Monthly Discourses and Essays by living writers: edited by D. S. Burnet, Cincinnati. This neatly executed work is continued as usual.

GEORGETOWN COLLEGE.

THE brethren and friends of reformation in Kentucky are now endeavoring to establish a permanent literary institution at Georgetown, Scott county. Hitherto they have been co-operating with our Baptist friends in the institution got up there some few years since, and indeed were the chief patrons and supporters of it. But the sectarian jealousies of a few *mere Regular Baptists* would not permit them to conduct themselves in a candid, dignified, and friendly manner towards those who had raised the institution from almost utter extinction to a very high degree of respectability and usefulness; but were in the adoption and prosecution of the ways and means to put it under a sectarian domination.

To this the friends of unsectarian literature, free discussion, and unbiassed discipline could not succumb, and have set on foot a new school on the broad principles of a general education, without respect to any of the peculiar *shibboleths* of the age. The following notice of its organization has recently fallen under our observation:—

"COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE and SCHOOL FOR CIVIL ENGINEERS: Georgetown, Ky. *Faculty*—Dr. *Knight*, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy; *S. G. Mullins*, Professor of

Digitized by Google

Ancient Languages; *C. R. Presrimineki*, Professor of Modern Languages; Dr. *S. Hatch*, Professor of Chemistry; *M. Sawseski*, Professor of Drawing and Painting; *T. F. Johnson*, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering; *J. Crenshaw*, Principal of the Preparatory Department.

"This institution is wholly unconnected with the Baptist College at this place, and will be conducted independently of all *extraneous influences*.

"The course of instruction will be as full and thorough as in any of the Western Colleges.

"The Professors will be diligently employed throughout the day, for six days in the week, giving instruction to the Students, and will in the main adopt the government and discipline that prevailed in the Georgetown College during the last session.

"A large and spacious house has been procured for the purpose, and every attention will be paid to the comfort, as well as the morals and the progress of the pupils.

"A chemical apparatus has been procured, and a philosophical apparatus will be received by the middle of the session.

"*Expenses*—Tuition for the winter session will be $21,00, payable in advance. Boarding and lodging, $2,00 per week.———*November* 7th, 1836."

Since we received the above, we have understood that there are some new additions to the Faculty, or some new modification in progress, of which the *pro tempore* appointment of brother *Walter Scott*, President, and *T. Fanning* of Nashville, a Professor, is noticed. An act of incorporation is expected. And may not an institution perfectly free from all sinister influence, with a talented and learned Faculty, command the patronage of not only our immediate friends, but of the community at large, whose interest it is to sustain a college of this independent and truly catholic character? It promises well, having already about *ninety* respectable students, while the sectarian institution in that place had not a few days since more than *twenty* pupils.

We would much rather that our Baptist friends had displayed a little more of the magnanimity of the Christian profession, and joined cordially on the ground of a fair equality with the friends of a truly *liberal* system of education, and built up one great school in Kentucky. But on this occasion, as in many other steps which they have taken towards our brethren, they seem to be blind to their own interests and usefulness—to be inobservant of their real standing with the whole community, as well as forgetful or ignorant of the spirit of the age. They have compelled the friends of reform on every occasion to desert them, although they have generally shown a willingness to co-operate with them in all things, as far as a due regard to conscience and character would permit. How long shall it be ere the unhallowed spirit of sectarian bigotry be dispossessed from these voluntary associations, and all Christians shall learn in the large, liberal, and sublime conceptions of true apostolic charity, to co-operate in the same cause of education, morality, and religion! We confidently hope that our brethren in the prosecution of this great object will pay a supreme regard to the political rights of all—to the immutable principles of moral righteousness—and to that Christian temper which never seeks to effect its object at the expense of the least of all the virtues which adorn Christian character.

A. C.

ADDRESS TO NON-SUBSCRIBERS.

We have forwarded the first number of the New Series to several persons not formerly subscribers, presuming that if they were fully apprized of the objects and character of the work they would be induced to patronize it, and to obtain for it a more general reading. Should we be mistaken in any instance, the person so addressed will please return the number, and we shall not enter his name upon our list—otherwise we shall continue to him the volume.

This work is not devoted to the narrow and exclusive platforms of schismatic orthodoxy or heterodoxy. As we live, and move, and breathe in an age of inquiry and research, we ought to catch its spirit and move forward and upward in our conceptions of the divine simplicity and incomparable excellence and majesty of the Christian Institution. This can only be accomplished by free discussion and careful examination of the Living Oracles of God; by bringing all things to that pure and perfect test of the doctrine which is according to godliness.

The human mind, under the accumulation of light in the present century, is growing too large for the suit of Grecian, Latin, and English traditions which were in fashion in the time of the Queen Elizabeth, or in that of the two Charleses. Those now-a-days of but the middle size cannot wear, without much inconvenience in body and in limb, the

Digitized by Google

standard dress in which men of the most gigantic stature in that age could move to and fro with the most perfect ease.

Truth, indeed, is immutably the same; but men only perceive certain portions of it in different ages, and even these portions are not apprehended with that clearness and force with which at other times they flash upon the human mind. At this crisis a general conviction is gaining ground every day that a large portion of the leaven of the traditions of less favored ages is yet working in the bosoms of most of the Protestant communities, and greatly retarding their influence and prosperity in pleading the cause of the Prince of Peace.

We do not, therefore, propose a single party tenet or dogma; we contend only for that truly catholic Christianity which is not to be qualified or limited with such epithets as Roman, Grecian, English, or American prefixed to it. Equally opposed to the despotic systems of orthodox prescription, and to the latitudinarian wanderings of a too compromising and charitable heterodoxy, we attempt the revival of that Christianity which knows neither Jew nor Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, noble or ignoble, bond or free. Regardless of the subtle refinements of metaphysical and speculative theology, we are bold to express the apostolic communications of supernatural truth in the frank and unscholastic terms of heavenly truth; and to invite all to the well-tried ancient and venerable foundation on which the Apostles began to rear the evangelical superstructure.

That this cause of reformation advances considerably beyond all that preceded it, is becoming daily more evident—that it is indeed carrying out the true Protestant principle to its legitimate issue, and placing its advocates beyond the jurisdiction of any sort of popery, European or American, foreign or domestic, is apparent. But that this feature has called down upon our heads a greater amount of reproach and opposition from the true partizans and advocates of the little party shibboleths, we cheerfully confess. This is a part of its glory; for a scheme which would suit and please to perfection any partizan profession, would neither suit the age nor the cause of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, who, were they now on earth, would likely have to lay again the old foundations, and find no party ready to receive them. We, however, have found an unexpected multitude in all denominations waiting for redemption from the too impotent and barren schemes of their respective sectarian professions; so that an unprecedented success has attended upon our efforts, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which we have labored. Still, however, we are but in our infancy, and therefore we solicit more readers, that the cause may be more generally known. We do this from a full conviction that free discussion can injure no person nor the truth, and that none can candidly examine the arguments on both sides of primitive and modern Christianity without manifest advantage to himself and generally to others. We ask a hearing because we think the subject is worthy of it—because we have a multitude of evidences that it is beneficial to society, religious and political—because all parties admit that further reformation is yet necessary and expedient; and because we ask no favor but a candid hearing; and if we cannot convince the mind of our readers or elicit truth, we have no desire to speak or write on the subject of religion.

Error at any price is too dear; but truth is always cheap however dearly it may be purchased; provided only, that it is moral and religious truth affecting the eternal destiny of man. Such are the truths for which we contend. To publish them throughout the length and breadth of this land is our most ardent desire; and if we could do it better by speaking than writing, we would much prefer it. But the Press now is much more potent and universal than the tongue; and, therefore, as it is our duty to use all means to spread the emancipating doctrine of the Reign of Heaven, we employ the Press. But without readers the Press can effect nothing; and in proportion to the number of readers is its power of doing good or evil. We therefore solicit new readers, and more readers; and, ever thankful for past favors, we again request all our friends to use their influence to increase our readers in their respective vicinities.

A. C.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER II.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *February*, 1837.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

TITLES OF THE POPE.

"*Universal Father;*" "*Holy Father;*" "*His Holiness;*" "*Sovereign Pontiff;*" "*Supreme Head of the Church on Earth;*" "*Pater Familias,*" (Father of the Family of God;) "*Successor of Peter;*" "*The Infallible One;*" "*Prince of the Apostles;*" "*Vicar of Christ;*" "*Father of Fathers;*" "*Lieutenant of Christ;*" "*Father and Doctor of all Christians;*" "*Lord of Lords;*" "*A God on Earth;*" "*Lord God the Pope;*" "*Prince of the World;*" "*Monarch of the Earth;*" "*King of Kings.*"

Cardinal Bellarmine, on the authority of councils, Book ii, chap. xvii, says, "All the names which are given in the scriptures to Christ, even these same names are given to the Pope; whence it appears that he is superior to the church." In Gratian's Decretals, page 1, dis. 96, Pope Nicholas to Michael, 7th chap., the Pope says, "He is a God, and therefore men cannot judge him." The Council of Florence, the 5th Lateran, and that of Trent make the Pope superior to general councils; and call him "an unlimited monarch." Johannes Devotus, vol. 1, b. 1, tit. 3, sect. 1, says, "The power of the Pope is episcopal, metropolitan, patriarchal, and temporal: his decisions from the chair are infallible." Gregory II. says, "The whole Western Nations reckoned Peter a terrestrial God." Labb. viii. 666, Marcellus, in a Lateran Council, called Julius the Pope "A God on earth." Pope Pius VII., so late as 1809, in excommunicating Napoleon, says, "Unworthy as we are, we represent the God of Peace." The Bishop of Grenada calls him "a God

Digitized by Google

on earth, not subject to a council." Bellarmine, De Pontiff. lit. 4, chap. 3, says, "The Pope cannot possibly err in decrees as to faith"—"no council is valid unless called and approved by him."

THE AUTHORITY, JURISDICTION, AND DIGNITY OF THE POPE.

There are at least four sects amongst Roman Catholics on the subject of the Pope's office, so far only as concerns supremacy or jurisdiction, to say nothing of the theories of his election and canonization:—

1. Of these the most popular is, that he is the supreme head of all authority on earth, whether political or religious;—that his jurisdiction extends over all persons and things.

2. The second class teach that his supremacy and authority extend only to spirituals—to the church and its concerns, without defining the extent of that jurisdiction.

3. The third teach that his spiritual power is absolute;—that he is the head of all councils, persons, and things ecclesiastic.

4. The fourth sect place him under the authority of councils, and only give him a sort of general presidency, as the chief executive head of the church.

We shall give our readers a specimen of the various theories of Papal authority, as taught by the leaders of the different sects in that immutably-mutable establishment. It does not, indeed, appear that the divine patent, or charter, of this most magnificent of all offices—that of Lieutenant-General of the King of Kings, is very intelligible; insomuch that it is not very apparent which of these sects is most orthodox. It is confessed that this problem is too hard for each and every one of their infallible methods of deciding controversies; and hence no council yet appears to have been equal to the adjustment of this point of doctrine. It was not allowed the last great Council of Trent to moot this question at all; and hence the church is likely never to become infallible in the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy.

Sect I. A very numerous and powerful party allege that the Papal authority is universal, absolute, and boundless, over all persons and things, by a divine and immutable charter. One of the Bishops of this sect, in the last great Lateran Council, styled the Pope, "Prince of the World;" and another called him, "King of Kings and Monarch of the Earth," and thus addressed Leo X:—"Snatch up, therefore, the two-edged sword of divine power committed to thee, and enjoin, command, and charge that a universal peace and alliance be made among Christians for at least ten years; and to that bind kings in the fetters of the Great King, and constrain nobles by the iron manacles of censure: for to thee is given all power in heaven and on earth." Episc. Pattæ, page 133.

Digitized by Google

Baronius the great annalist of the Roman hierarchy, affirms all this substantially many a time. "That the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal, there can be no doubt."—"God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church." Annals, sect 57. 53—23.

Pope Sixtus V., in his bull against the two sons of wrath, Henry, Prince of Navarre, and the Prince of Conde, commences his decree in the following words:—"The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes: it passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all; and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance on them, casting them down from their thrones though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth as the aspiring ministers of Lucifer."—"We deprive them [the King and the Prince] and their posterity forever of their dominions and kingdoms," &c. Bulla Sixti V. contra Henr. Navarr. R. &c. Barrow, page 18.

In the aforesaid decree, and in conclusion thereof, there is this most arrogant assumption:—"By the authority of these presents *we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience; and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to obey them or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands.*" A. D. 1585.

To the same effect fully and precisely is the bull of Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth, A. D. 1570; and nearly so is the decree of Clement VI. against the Emperor Louis IV., A. D. 1340.

Boniface VIII. (as is still extant in the canon law Extrav. Com. lib. 1, tit. 8, cap. 1,) Anno Domini 1294, says: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff"—"For one sword must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power; whence if the earthly power doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power." This ambitious and arrogant decree has been confirmed by the highest of all earthly sanctions, as Romanists believe; that is, by a general council. "We," says Leo X. (in his bull read and passed in the Lateran Council,) "do renew and approve that holy constitution with approbation of the present holy council;" and Canus saith, "The Lateran Council did renew and approve that extravagant constitution."

Pope Innocent IV. did not only entertain, but did fully exemplify this notion in his deprivation of the Emperor Frederick, A. D. 1245.

Digitized by Google

In his General Council of Lyons he says, "We"—"denounce and by sentence deprive, absolving all who are held by oath of allegiance from such oath for ever; by apostolic authority firmly prohibiting, that no man henceforth do obey or regard him as Emperor or King, shall immediately lie under the band of excommunication." P. Innoc. IV. in Conc. Ludg.

Pope Innocent III. as M. Paris calls him, "*True Wonder of the World and Changer of the Age*," did affirm "*the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun doth the moon*," and applieth these words of Jeremiah (i. 10.) to him:—"See I have set thee over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down," &c. A. D. 1215. Barrow on the Supremacy, 21. This Pope deposed the Emperor Otho IV.; first having anathematized him, he deprived him of his crown.

In the great Lateran Council, under this said Pope, which, according to the Council of Trent, did represent the whole church, it was also decreed "that if a temporal Lord, being required and admonished by the church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the Metropolitan and the other comprovincial Bishops, be noosed in the bands of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics," &c. Conc. Later. cap. 3, in Decret. Greg. lib. 5, tit. 7, cap. 13.

Paschal II., A. D. 1099, deposed Henry IV., and excited his enemies to persecute him; telling them, that "they could not offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God, than by impugning him who endeavored to take the kingdom from God's church." P. Paschal, Ep. 7, ad Rib. laud. com.

But we have this doctrine fully avowed and set before us by the renowned Gregory VI., in whose person the papacy attained its full splendor and shone forth in all its effulgence. In his own epistles and in the councils under him, he fully explains himself on this point.—We shall add to this notice of the principal sect of Romanists by quoting a part of his bull against Henry IV. the Emperor of Germany:—

"For the dignity and defence of God's holy church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration King Henry, son of Henry, some time Emperor, who too boldly and rashly has laid hands on thy church, and absolve all Christians subject to the empire from that oath, whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the church.

Digitized by Google

"Go to, therefore, most holy Prince of the Apostles; and what I said, by interposing your authority confirm, that all men may now at length understand, if you can bind and loose in heaven, that you can also upon earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have: for if you can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be deemed concerning these inferior and profane things? And if is your part to judge angels who govern proud Princes, what becometh it you to do toward their servants? Let Kings now and all secular princes learn by this man's example what you can do in heaven, and in what esteem you are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight the commands of the holy church, and put forth suddenly this judgment, that all men may understand, that not casually, but by your means, this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom." Plat. in Greg. 7, et tom 7, Conc. Rom. 3, Apud Bin. page 484.

There are many who regard, or say that they regard, this doctrine as a novelty, though practised for more than five hundred years while popery was in its zenith. They blamed Gregory VII. for innovating and assuming too much, &c. No doubt many there are who think so. But to appreciate aright this matter, we must remember that from the time of Boniface III., or from St. Gregory's time in the close of the 6th century to this period, there was a race of poor mean wretches generally obtruded into St. Peter's chair, void of every virtue, "most of them very beasts," who depended on the smiles of emperors for their very being, and therefore dare not assume the spirit of their station. Leo IX., Stephanus VI., John VIII., and Nicholas I. "*did think it very unbecoming that they should be subject to an earthly empire whom the Divine Majesty had set over a heavenly.*" Pope Leo Ep. 1, chap. 12. But they had to be humble from the necessity of their condition.

Gregory VII., however, thought that he introduced no novelty; for he endeavors to sanction all his proceedings by the example of his predecessors, and alleges Pope Zachary, who, he says, "*did depose the king of the Franks, and did absolve all the French from the oath of fidelity which they had taken unto him, not so much for his iniquities as because he was unfit for such a power.*" Decr. 2. part. cans. 15, 96.

Adrian I. in 772, did decree an anathema on every king and potentate that would permit the censure of the Roman Pontiff to be violated. And Gregory II. in 730, because "the Eastern Emperor did cross the worshipping of images, did withdraw subjection from him, and thrust his authority out of Italy." "He," saith Baronius, "did effectually cause both the Romans and Italians to recede from obedience to the Emperor." Bar. Anno 730. Thus, as Baronius declares, is "he left to posterity a worthy example that heretical princes should not be

Digitized by Google

suffered to reign in the church of Christ, if, being warned, they were found pertinacious in error." page 730. Thus we can distinctly trace back this assumed power, as St. Thomas Aquinas the Evangelical chooses to express it, "*The top of both powers in the Pope*," so far back as the time of Gregory II., and farther than this the history of this papal assumption reacheth not back.

Sect II. The second sect in the church of Rome are those whom Cardinal Bellarmine and Cardinal Baronius choose to call "a sort of heretics skulking every where in the bosom of their church all over Christendom, who restrain the Pope's authority so far as not to allow him any power over sovereign princes in temporal affairs; much less any power of depriving them of their kingdoms and principalities." "*These take one of the two swords, and allow only the spiritual.*" This Baronius calls "*the heresy of the politics.*" France has generally embraced this heresy, and it is in contradistinction from the Gregorian assumptions called the cisalpine or moderate doctrine of papal authority. Some of this class speak so indefinitely of his spiritual supremacy, that it is impossible to learn how far they do extend it.

Some there are who give him an absolute and omnipotent supremacy in all things spiritual, while others disallow any such unlimited authority.

Sect III. The Florentine Synod has well defined in the following words the spiritual jurisdiction claimed by the more popular and high church party, if we might so call them, on the subject of the Pope's spiritual authority. The decree speaks on this wise:—"The apostolical chair and the Roman High Priest doth hold a primacy over the universal church; and that the Roman High Priest is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Lieutenant of Christ, and the Head of the church, and that he is the Father and Doctor of all Christians; and that unto him, in St. Peter, full power is committed to feed and direct and govern the Catholic church under Christ, according as is contained in the acts of general councils and in the holy canons."

That, in the words of Leo X., approved by the Lateran Synod, "Christ, before his departure from the world, did, in solidity of the rocks, *institute Peter and his successors to be his Lieutenants; to whom it is so necessary to obey, that he that doth not obey must die the death.*" [Pope Leo X. in Conc. Later. sess. 11, pag. 151.] This party makes the Pope superior to the whole church, and even to its representative, a general council. They give him power to convocate councils, to preside in them, and to suggest matter, direct and control their debates, &c. &c.

Sect IV. Another party makes the Pope's spiritual authority inferior to a general council, and give him only a species of presidency—making

Digitized by Google

him an executive only of the church. Of this party we cannot now speak more particularly. The first class appear to be the true sons of the genuine hierarchy, and, as such, merit a larger share of our attention. A. C.

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35.]

JERUSALEM.

In the midst of my cogitations and conjectures respecting Ancient Christianity, my mind became confused, and I felt oppressed by a thousand vague and uncertain images. At length, when I was about sinking into total abstraction, I was suddenly refreshed by a gentle breath of air issuing from the casement which I now perceived to be partly open, and it occurred to me that a moon-light walk might tend to calm my perturbed imagination. The night was mild for the season; and though the wind was heard occasionally, hoarsely murmuring at a distance through the leafless groves, the sky was serene, and the rising moon, just past the full, shed a soft and silvery radiance over the face of Nature which seemed lovely even in death. As I sauntered along the margin of the winding stream upon whose glassy surface the dark outline of the overhanging trees was contrasted with the tremulous reflection of the moon and stars, I perceived advancing towards me a light and graceful form, enveloped in a fantastic drapery, and wearing a head-dress of what appeared to be eagle's feathers. The countenance was youthful and appeared familiar to me, but the expression was ever varying, and the whole person was apparently of such a shadowy and aerial substance, that I was at once reminded of the swift Camilla; the fabled Ctesilas, who is said to have scarcely imprinted the sand with his feet, and other celebrated personages, who are represented as having had so little *materialism* about them that they were obliged to carry weights in their pockets, by way of ballast, to avoid being blown away by the winds.

"I have come," said the figure, addressing me, "to assist you in your researches concerning the customs and events of the past.

Digitized by Google

I belong to an order of beings between whom and the human mind there is so close an alliance that we are not only acquainted with all its workings, but it is our province to remove the difficulties in which it becomes involved. I some time since rendered important services to some of your friends in the matter of prophecy and the state of the dead, and still more lately in the knotty question about the period of Adam's residence in the garden of Eden, not to speak of many other deep matters; but, as indeed is usually the case, not one of them had the candor to acknowledge to whom they were so much indebted. At present you wish to understand Primitive Christianity; suppose then you go and see it in the place of its nativity."

Being always in favor of occular demonstration, this proposition appeared so reasonable, that I could offer no objection. Upon which the figure clasping me gently round the waist, unfolded a pair of wings which I had not before noticed, and I felt myself immediately borne aloft with inconceivable velocity. I began now to think that my companion certainly belonged to the *vespertilio-homines* of which I had read an account lately as existing in the moon; and I was about to ask the question, when I found myself suddenly placed upon a lofty elevation, and presented with a scene which engrossed my whole attention.

Before me lay a mountainous country. A succession of deep vallies and towering hills terminated in the distance in what seemed to be, from the reflection of the rays of the moon which had now attained considerable elevation, a large sheet of water. Immediately behind this arose a dark and still loftier chain of mountains so unbroken as to present the appearance of an immense wall, not one peak being discernible, but merely slight inflections here and there as though the hand of the painter who drew the horizontal line along the sky had slightly trembled in some places. The heavens above were clear and beautiful, and the luminaries of the firmament shone with an unusually soft and yellow light. Immediately below me, a steep declivity was studded with clumps and rows of trees, many of which in this mild region, where the atmosphere was warm and fragrant, still retained their foliage.

I looked around me: my companion had disappeared. I per-

Digitized by Google

ceived, however, at a short distance an aged and venerable-looking personage, whose hoary beard descended upon his breast, and whose countenance appeared strongly indicative of sincerity and benevolence. He had a writer's ink-horn by his side, and bore in his hand a roll of parchment. I recognized in him the Genius of History, engaged in compiling the records of ages; and requested him to explain the meaning of the objects by which I was surrounded.

"The dark and lofty mountains," replied he with a familiar air, "which you have observed towards the East, are the mountains of Arabia.* That distant sheet of water is the Salt sea† whose sluggish waves cover what was once the vale of Siddim, where, in the days of Abraham, was fought the battle of the kings;‡ and where the proud cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, Admah and Zeboim, were overwhelmed by the Divine judments.§ You would suppose it to be close at hand, but it is distant seven leagues, and the intervening hills are connected with the mountains of Judea.‖ To the north-east you will perceive that these hills become more lofty and majestic, and their towering cliffs, and abrupt precipices, and the dark shadows in which every thing lies buried below, present a sublime appearance. It was in this wild and gloomy region, which has been often infested by robbers, that Jesus laid the scene of his parable of the Good Samaritan. Beyond these hills, and in the same direction, you may see the verdant and fertile pastures of the plain of Jericho, watered by the Jordan whose course you can distinctly trace.¶ But that you may fully comprehend your position, we will turn to the West."

I turned accordingly and followed my conductor a few paces to a rock upon the western brow of the eminence, and saw before me at a distance of three-fourths of a mile, a large and splendid city, situated upon hills considerably lower than that on which I stood, and surrounded with a massy and irregular wall surmounted with towers and battlements. A deep and dark ravine sepa rated me from the eastern wall which rose to an immense height

---

* Chateaubriand's Travels, p. 273. † Id. ibid. Gen. xiv, 3. Deut. iii. 17. ‡ Gen, xiv. 8. § Gen. xix. 24. Deut. xxix. 23. ‖ Chateaub. Trav. p. 273. ¶ Clarke's Travel's, vol. ii, page 372.

Digitized by Google

from the bottom of this valley.* Lofty hills encompassed the city upon every side,† and while their picturesque summits, silvered upon their eastern side, were painted in bold relief against the sky, the objects in the amphitheatre in which the city was placed, were involved in dense masses of light and shade, as wall or tower, pinnacle or battlement, received or lost the straggling moon-beams. Among these objects there was one which particularly arrested my attention. Just above the dark eastern wall already mentioned, and in that part of the city which was nearest to me, arose an immense edifice of such inconceivable grandeur and magnificence, that as I contemplated its numberless spires and turrets, its porticoes and pillars which shone resplendent in the light, their brilliant whiteness contrasted with the deep gloom of the intervening valley, I was entranced with admiration.

"The city before you," said my companion, "is Jerusalem, and the mount upon which you stand is the mount of Olives."‡

Is this then, cried I, Zion, the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth, in whose palaces God has been known for a refuge, and whose foundation is in the holy mountains!§ And are these the scenes so often honored by the presence of the Redeemer!

"It was on this spot," pursued he, "that Jesus stood when he beheld the city and wept over it, and it is from this point that it can be seen to the greatest advantage.‖ Upon the eastern ascent of the mount towards Jericho you may perceive at the distance of a mile and a quarter the beatiful village of Bethany or the house of dates, surrounded by an abundance of palm trees. This was the abode of Mary and Lazarus, and it was from the eminence above it that Jesus while blessing his disciples was parted from them and received into heaven.¶ Bethphage, or the house of figs, is immediately adjacent; and it was by this road, strewed with boughs of palm and the garments of the admiring throng, that he made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem.** Turn now to the city. The deep valley which intervenes is the valley of

---

* Upwards of 700 feet: see Brown's Jewish Antiq. vol. i. page 51; Josephus' Antiq. xx. 9. † Psalm cxxv. 2; lxxvii. 1; Joseph. Jewish Wars, B. v. c. 1. ‡ Zech. xiv. 4. § Psalm xlviii 2, 3; lxxxvii. 1; Lam. ii. 15. ‖ Luke xix. 41; Clarke's Travels, vol. ii. page 372. ¶ John xi. 1, 18; Brown's Antiquities, volume i, page 60; Luke xxiv. 50. ** Id. xix. 29.

Digitized by Google

Jehosaphat,* through the centre of which flows the brook Cedron.† That ravine to the left is the valley of the son of Hinnom, noted for the cruel worship of Moloch.‡ That beautiful building opposite to us which rivets your attention is the Temple. It is built of white variegated marble, and is the third in order from that of Solomon, having been commenced by Herod seventeen years before the birth of Christ.‖ Near its north-western angle you may observe a dark square building which elevates itself considerably above the temple. This is the tower Antonia, also built by Herod the Great. It contains spacious and splendid apartments, and forms the residence of the Roman governors and their retinue. It was here that Jesus was brought before Pilate through a communication leading immediately from the Temple.§ The mount upon which these edifices stand, is Moriah, where Abraham offered up Isaac,¶; and upon that part of it immediately outside of the western wall of the city you may perceive an eminence. This is Calvary where Christ was crucified.** South of Calvary lies the hill Acra, of a crescentic form, and less elevated than Moriah. Upon this the lower city, formerly called Salem, is built, and you may perceive that the rows of houses descend into a valley†† upon the opposite side of which they re-ascend upon a sloping hill much loftier than either Acra or Moriah, and which is surmounted by a citadel. This is Mount Zion the site of the city of David,‡‡ anciently called Jebus,§§ and taken from the Jebusites by David.‖‖ From these two words *Jebus* and *Salem* is derived the name Jerusalem.¶¶ Its history"——

Pardon me, said I, I am impatient to enter this beloved city.

"I will be your *cicerone*," said my companion.

Immediately, we began to descend the western side of the mount which was adorned with clumps of the olive tree, the palm-tree and the cedar.*** Between its base and the brook Cedron my conductor pointed to a garden enclosed by a wall of

---

* Brown's Antiq. vol. i. page 58; Joel iii. 2. † 2 Sam. xv. 23; Jer. xxxi. 4; John xviii. 1; Chateaub. Trav. page 312. ‡ Jer. xix. 2.; Id. xxxii 35. ‖ Joseph. Antiq. xv. 1, 11; Prideaux Connect A. A. C. 47; Id. A. A. C. 17; John ii. 20; Joseph. Antiq. xv. 11. § Joseph. Wars, v. 5; Matth. xxvii. 2; Acts xxi. 31. ¶ Gen. xxii. 2; Brown's Antiq. vol i, page 47. ** Luke xxiv. 33; Heb. xiii. 12. †† Called the "valley of the cheesemongers;" Joseph. Wars, book 5. chap. 4. ‡‡ 2 Sam. v. 7; 1 Kings viii. 1. §§ Joshua xv. 8, 63; xviii. 28; Judges xix. 10, 11. ‖‖ Joseph. Jewish Wars, book 5. chap. 4. ¶¶ Calmet, page 522. *** Chateaub. Trav. page 313.

Digitized by Google

loose stones, which was indistinctly visible in the gloom of the valley.

"This," said he, "is the garden of Gethsemane. It was here that Jesus was betrayed by Judas, and apprehended by the chief priests."*

I gazed upon the sacred spot, hallowed by so many recollections, and my eyes filled with tears as I thought of the agony and the sweat of blood; while my heart felt indignant at the perfidy of the traitor.

"It was here also," continued my guide, "that Peter drew his sword (for there were two swords) and cut off the ear of Malchus when the rest of the disciples fled. Yet, but a little while afterwards he denied his Master, as Jesus himself foretold. But he has since nobly redeemed his character."†

I suppose, said I, that it is from the circumstance of the disciples having two swords, that the Pope of Rome asserts the same right; and that as he claims to be the successor of Peter who cut off the ear of Malchus, he feels himself authorized to cut off the ears of the people (to speak figuratively) so that they cannot any longer hear the scriptures. I perceive, however, this difference, that the Pope does this to defend *himself*, whereas Peter drew his sword in defence of his *Master;* and that the latter magnanimously restored the ear even to his enemy. L

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF CHRIST.§

"*Malus ut arboribus decori est, ut vitibus uvae,*
"*Ulque rosae campis, ut lilia vallibus alba,*
"*Sic* Christus *decus omne suis.*"

CANTICLES, chap. ii. ver. 2, 3.

As the rich fruit the bending trees adorns,
Grapes deck the vine; and roses without thorns
Fair Sharon's plain; or lilies grace the vale;
So Christ alone his saints with charms that never fail.

SOME object, possessed of real beauty, or endowed by imagination with fictitious charms, engrosses the affections of every human being. The tender infant delights in the maternal bosom: the hoary miser

* John xviii. † Id. ib. Acts iv. 8.

§ This article appeared originally in a contemporary journal under a different title.

Digitized by Google

glories in his hidden treasures. The ardent lover, and the artful politician; the military chieftain, and the peaceful artizan; the lowly rustic, and the haughty monarch, bow with equal devotion, though at different shrines; and all pursue, with unwearied diligence, that fancied good, from the possession of which they anticipate perfect felicity; and which constitutes for a time, the *ultima Thule*—the most distant aim of their ambition. No dangers or difficulties, however threatening; no temporary privations, however great, can quench the ardor of their zeal, or stay the constancy of their perseverance; and disappointment itself serves, not to terminate pursuit, but only to change its object.

Whether it be a faint remembrance of his primeval glory which induces man thus to seek to better his condition, and to retrieve his fortunes; or merely the consciousness of present suffering and privation, which forms the motive by which he is impelled in the pursuit of happiness; certain it is, that this eagerness of desire for more than he possesses, these incessant exertions to fill up the measure of his joys, serve to show that he is a *fallen* and an *imperfect* being. For he cannot be absolutely perfect, to whom any thing is yet to be added; and as desire always implies its object, man ceases to be imperfect only when he has no longer any thing left to wish for. And it is therefore, because he is conscious of his deficiency, that he labors to supply it by adscititious worth, and hopes that the possession of the beloved object will supply his wants, and render him perfect and complete.

Yet how rarely does he realize his expectations! How seldom does he secure the wished-for blessing! How often does it fly before him, as the setting sun before the approaching shades of evening, never to be overtaken! How often does it allure him to a vain pursuit,

> "As rising on its purple wing,
> The insect queen* of eastern spring,
> O'er emerald meadows of Cashmere,
> Invites the young pursuer near,
> And leads him on from flow'r to flow'r,
> A weary chase, and wasted hour;
> Then leaves him, as it soars on high,
> With panting heart and tearful eye."

And even if obtained, how oft,

> "The lovely toy, too fiercely sought,
> Has lost its charms by being caught;
> For every touch that woo'd its stay,
> Hath brush'd its brightest hues away,
> Till charm, and hue, and beauty gone,
> 'Tis left to fly or fall alone."

---

* *The blue-winged butterfly of Cashmere, the most rare and beautiful of the species.*

Digitized by Google

Or, if it does not thus perish at the moment of fruition, how soon is it found inadequate to supply his wishes! How totally different it proves to be from that happiness for which he so anxiously sighed!—The glittering bauble which the child so wishfully desired, ceases to gratify when it is once obtained. The possession of a world could not make him *perfect* who wept because he had not more worlds to conquer!

Yet there is one amidst the throng, whose pursuit has not been vain, and who has not experienced the bitterness of disappointment. His Beloved is more than another beloved, the chiefest among ten thousand, and his love is better than wine. To him, IMMANUEL is the source of supreme enjoyment, and the unfailing fountain of perennial delight. The draughts of pleasure which he receives from Him contain no bitterness, but are purer than the streams of Lebanon. The grateful food which he provides is sweeter to his taste, than the clusters of the vine, with all the pleasant fruits. As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is his Beloved among the sons; and beneath his shadow he sits down with great delight. To him he is the lily of the valley, and as the rose of Sharon—the rose without a thorn. The beauty of his character is his study all the day: his faithfulness and truth, his joy in the night season; and like the sunflower, which, though fixed to the soil by its root, turns continually its head towards the sun,* he loves to look off to Jesus, and to contemplate the supreme object of his affections. For by him alone he feels himself *adorned*, in him alone made *perfect:* no anxious wish for happiness is now unsatisfied, but all his wants and deficiencies are forever removed; and he feels himself *complete* in him who is the head of all principality and power, and who is made to him WISDOM from God, RIGHTEOUSNESS also, SANCTIFICATION and REDEMPTION.

He delights not in the boasted excellence of Athenian wisdom and philosophy; the speculations of Aristotle, the reveries of Zeno, or the bold pretensions of Epicurus. He has learned to despise a philosophy which betrayed its weakness, and acknowledged its inadequacy to supply his wants, by imposing an absolute silence upon desire, and asserting that the destruction of the wish for happiness was equivalent to enjoyment. He pities a wisdom which brought no salvation; which taught men to derive their gods from the world, instead of deriving the world from God; and to worship thirty thousand divinities, the creation of human fancy, and the workmanship of mortal hands. To him the wisdom of the wise is foolishness, and the strength of the mighty weakness; for Christ has become to him the *wisdom and the power of*

* "Caput illa suum, quamvis radice tenetur,
"Vertitur ad solem."

Digitized by Google

God. In him he finds laid up all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and his soul rejoices in his inexhaustible riches, the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God, whose judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out.

He covets not the applauding voice of men, whose scrutiny reaches only the exterior, whose acclamations fail to silence the clamors of a disapproving conscience, and whose flattery fails to soothe the dull cold ear of death; nor does he dread their condemning frowns, for God has justified him; and being *declared innocent* by Him who trieth the hearts and reins, he has peace with God through the Beloved who has become the Lord his righteousness.

He needs not to seclude himself from the haunts of men, in the shades of retirement, the monastic cell, or the solitude of the recluse, for Christ has sanctified him in body, soul, and spirit: has *separated* him from the vices of the world, and *set apart* its blessings for his enjoyment.

Nor does he seek that sovereign good in vain attempts to appease an awakened conscience by the mortifications of the cloister, the severities of penance, or the voluntary humilities of an austere devotion: for his Lord has borne his griefs and carried his sorrows, and through him he has redemption, *even the forgiveness of sins.* He is his rock of strength, his refuge, and his salvation; and to him there is no name so dear and so delightful as the name Jesus.*

In a word, he engages not in the pursuit of wealth, for the unsearchable riches of Christ delight his soul: he longs not to be a conqueror of the world, for all things are his, whether the world, or life or death, or things present, or things to come: he strives not to gain an earthly crown, for Christ has prepared for him a heavenly diadem: he seeks not an alliance with the noble and the great, for with a pure heart, and robes washed in the blood of the Lamb, he has taken his seat among the sons of God; and while he beholds the vain pursuits of men, with all their crimes, their miseries, and their disappointments, he finds new charms in Him, who is his shield, his trust, his treasure, his love, his life, his all.

Were life forever like a calm and tranquil sea, or a fair and cloudless sky; if man, like the sun-dial, had no hours to mark but those which are serene and bright;† even then the pleasure which he enjoys in Christ, would be purer, more perfect and delightful, than the tumultuous and illusive joys possessed by the most favored of the favorites of fortune. But it is at those gloomy periods of terror and alarm, when the storms of adversity arise, and the gay sensualist, who basked securely in the sunshine of prosperity, is filled with despair, and can

* Saviour.—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."

† *Horas non numero, nisi serenas.*

Digitized by Google

find no refuge, it is then that the Christian can rejoice in the Lord, and joy in the God of his salvation. It is in the hour of darkness, and distress, and desolation, that he finds himself indeed COMPLETE in Him who is light, and life, and glory. It is when he walks through the valley of the shadow of death that he fears no ill, for his rod and his staff comfort him;—it is then that he can exclaim, O! happy day, that brings me into the assembly of the spirits of the just, and delivers me from all the troubles of this mortal coil! for I am going to my Jesus, the lover of my soul, the Son of the Highest, in whose presence there is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore.

R. R.

EDUCATION.

THE following notice of the Prussian system of education, or of public instruction, merits the most sedate consideration of every humane and benevolent citizen. There is no object of pursuit, except that of religion, in which our theory and practice are more at war, than in the department of public education. We all admit that intelligence is essential to virtue, and that intelligence and virtue are the main pillars of our free institutions. We moreover inculcate the excellency, the super-excellency of knowledge—of mental and moral culture as connected with human destiny. We say it is education that makes the man—that confers dignity and glory on our race—and that the diffusion of it among all classes and conditions is the greatest of earthly blessings; and yet, alas! how little is yet done in comparison of what ought to be done, even in our own country, to make it accessible to all—to prevent the possibility of the want of a good education to any one born on our territory. And may I be permitted to say, that until this is done by our government—until this is accomplished by the American family—we shall want one of the essential attributes, one of the distinguishing characteristics of a *civilized* population. If it should yet require the appropriation of a hundred millions of dollars to bring a good education to the door of every American citizen, to compel the education of all, when it cannot otherwise be accomplished, we would be wanting in the grand elements of a Christian community, nay, of a wise and prudent and moral people, if we should not, situated as we are, make vigorous efforts to raise that sum, and devote it to that use.

I know no value in money beyond food and raiment, except so far as it puts within our grasp the means of instruction. Knowledge is better

Digitized by Google

than gold, and moral excellency more to be desired than the onyx and the sapphire. The ruby and the diamond are not to be compared with the brightness of wisdom, nor the beauties of intellectual and moral refinement. Every thing on earth but true science may rise above its value; but that knowledge which "softens the rude and calms the boisterous mind" is not to be too highly appreciated.

I trust there is a redeeming spirit about to enlighten and possess the American family on this subject, and that we shall be stirred up by the example of *Protestant Prussia*, if by no brighter example at home, to commence a new era on this the most vital of all the interests of our country and of human-kind. A. C.

From the American Presbyterian.

PRUSSIAN SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

Mr. Editor,

Is it known to the readers of the *American Presbyterian*, that the best system of public instruction now in operation on the globe, is in the despotic government of Prussia? Europe may well look on with wonder and admiration—and not only Europe, but America, republican, educated, reforming, innovating, boasting America—whilst the absolute monarch, *Frederic William* III., during a long reign of 40 years, has been truly acting the *father* of his people, in devising and perfecting the most liberal system of *popular education* in the world. "The kingdom of Prussia, at the present time, affords the rare spectacle of an absolute sovereign, exerting all his power for the intelligence and moral improvement of his people. The government of Prussia, in which the voice of the king is every thing, and the voice of the people nothing, does more for the education of the whole people, than has ever been done by any government on earth." This quotation is from the opening of a discourse on Prussian Education, by Professor *Stowe*, of Cincinnati, delivered before the late Convention of Teachers in Columbus, Ohio. The discourse was delivered during the session of the Ohio State Legislature, and, on the recommendation of Gov. *Lucas*, was ordered to be printed by that body. It has since been published by Messrs. *Truman & Smith*, of Cincinnati, in another form, making a convenient little volume of about one hundred pages; and is now for sale at most of our book stores. In his communication to the State Legislature on the subject, Governor Lucas uses the following language:—"Considering the subject of education of the most intrinsic importance, as tending to promote the happiness and prosperity of the people, any information that

Digitized by Google

is calculated to enlighten the public mind on this important subject, is deemed truly desirable, and cannot fail to be interesting to the friends of general instruction; and believing that much useful information is contained in the discourse of Professor Stowe, above alluded to, I have thought it advisable to submit the copy transmitted to my care, to the consideration of the General Assembly, together with his letter transmitting the same, and respectfully request that they receive that respectful attention that is due to the importance of the subject."

We have observed that in various parts of our country addresses have been delivered and published of like character with the production now under consideration. "Cousin's Report" to the French government, on Prussian education, which has been translated and extensively circulated, both in Britain and America, seems to have excited this universal attention to the subject; and it is of course the ground-work, in matters of fact, of all such publications. Although in the little work before us, Professor Stowe has drawn somewhat from other sources, yet he has embodied "all the important principles, and all the great facts illustrative of those principles contained in the Report." And, what is still better, he has pointed out a mode of adapting and applying this system of public instruction to the genius of American institutions, and to the present circumstances of our population. It would be singular, but it would be the part of wisdom, if our different State Legislatures would consent to be taught a lesson of enlightened policy with regard to learning, by the experience of the Prussian government. It is useless to be continually lauding ourselves as the most enlightened people on the globe, whilst the appalling fact is staring us in the face, that thousands of our countrymen cannot read and write, and that they are training up their children in the same deplorable ignorance. Prussia is a military despotism; yet the Prussians are the best educated people in the world; and why? Simply because *school duty is placed in all respects on the same ground as military duty*. Every parent is obliged by law to educate his children; and every child in the kingdom, between the ages of 7 and 14, must be at school, whether he has a parent or not. There can be no exemption whatever, short of physical inability or absolute idiocy. "So completely successful has the plan been in securing a uniform attendance, that the number of children regularly attending school, is greater than the whole number in the kingdom between 7 and 14, the period in which attendance is peremptorily demanded by law."

We have not room to give even an outline of the system of public instruction, as developed in this discourse. We might copy the whole, and then give but a general view of the plan, as

Digitized by Google

now in operation in Prussia. The reader, who is not yet better informed on the subject, may derive some tolerable notion of its extent, from the the following remarks of Professor Stowe:—"It is difficult to convey to an American audience, an exact conception of this system, in language borrowed from our own institutions; but I will endeavor to state what would be the principal features of a system for the United States, analogous to that in Prussia. In the general government there would be a *Secretary of Public Instruction*, a member of the President's cabinet, like the Secretary of State, or War, &c. who, with the assistance of a council composed partly of clergymen, would have the superintendence of the whole business of education throughout the country. In every state there would be a University established at the public expense, for professional education and instruction in the higher branches of literature and science. In each state, the care of education would be committed to a *School Board*, directly responsible to the General Secretary for the Union. In each congressional district there would be one or more seminaries for the education of teachers, according to the populousness of the district; and the official superintendent of education in the district would be directly responsible to the School Board of the state. In every county there would be a gymnasium for the instruction of young men in the languages and sciences, preparatory to entering the Universities, and the care of education in the country, would be committed to an inspector, who would make it his sole business, and report to the School Board of the state. In every township there would be a high school for the instruction of the youth of both sexes in the higher branches, necessary to qualify them for the active business of life; and in every school district an elementary school for primary instruction. In the townships and districts the concerns of education would be superintended by a committee, one half of whom would be clergymen. All these institutions, from the district school to the University, would be regularly visited by examiners appointed for that purpose, and their conditions reported to the proper authorities. All these officers would be appointed by government, under certain legal restrictions, and paid according to the amount of service rendered."

Compared with this, how meagre is the provision which our government has made for the education of the people. And yet it would require this to place the *freemen* of America on an equal footing, in point of learning, with the *subjects* of Prussia's monarch!

Our common schools scarcely deserve to be mentioned in comparison with this system, as a provision for education, at all adequate to the wants of the people. All the funds hitherto ap-

Digitized by Google

propriated to this cause, either by our general government or that of the states, are as the dust in the balance; and the good resulting from them is much like the harvest we might expect to reap from "sowing a ten-acre field with a peck of wheat."

There is much in this little volume we would wish to lay before the reader. It deserves an extensive circulation. We select one passage more on the *course of instruction* in Prussia. "The law declares that every complete elementary school must comprehend the following objects:—

1. Religious instruction, as a means of forming the moral character of children, according to the positive truths of Christianity.

2. The German language, and in the provinces where a foreign language is spoken, the language of the country in addition to the German.

3. The elements of geometry, together with the general prinples of drawing.

4. The elements of physics, geography, general history, and especially the history of Prussia.

5. Singing, with a view to improve the voices of children, and to perfect and ennoble the popular songs and church psalmody.

6. Writing and gymnastic exercises, which fortify all the senses, especially that of sight.

7. The simplest manual labors and husbandry.

Every high school is required to give still more complete instruction in all the branches above mentioned; and in addition to these, to teach Latin, the more important modern languages, such as the French and English, and the constitution and laws of Prussia. Every scholar in the elementary schools is required to complete the full course of seven years, and in the high schools the course of three years in addition; and accurate reports on this subject are regularly transmitted to the Minister of Public Instruction. The Bible is the basis of religious instruction in all the schools; the Protestant children are taught from the Protestant translation, and the Catholic children from the Catholic translation, and the Jewish children from the Old Testament, if the parents require it." Y. Y.

DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSALISM.

INTRODUCTORY CORRESPONDENCE.

UTICA, Nov. 14, 1836.

Dear Sir.

I HAVE recently received from Rev. G. W. Montgomery, of Auburn, N. Y. two numbers of the Millennial Harbinger, containing the commencement and continuance of a discussion, first between Mr. Spencer and yourself, and then between Mr. Montgomery

Digitized by Google

and yourself, on the meaning of the words *gehenna*, *hades*, *aion*, *aionion*, *olam*, *akatalutos*, and other words in the original of the scriptures, together with certain texts, supposed to have an important bearing in deciding the question whether the punishment of the wicked will be limited or endless in duration. Accompanying these numbers of the Harbinger is a letter from Mr. Montgomery, in which he says he transfers the controversy on the part of the Universalists into my hands for continuance, this being a mutual agreement between yourself and him, at an interview had in person in June last, for reasons which I need not here state, and perfectly understood by both of you, he having made choice of me as his substitute. He also informs me that whenever the discussion was resumed, what has already been published was to be copied by, and all the future discussion published in, some Universalist paper, as well as the Harbinger. I propose, sir, to republish what has already appeared in the Harbinger, in the Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate, published in this city, of which I am one of the Editors, and of which there are circulated weekly about 7000 copies. And after the discussion is renewed to insert the whole of it on both sides; expecting you will do the same in the Harbinger.

The particular object I have in writing you this letter, is, to ascertain *when* it will best suit your convenience to resume the discussion. As I have heard that you either had engaged, or were about to do so, in a discussion with a Catholic Bishop at Cincinnati—and not knowing at what time that was to commence, or whether it would suit you to have both discussions in progress at the same time, or whether you would prefer finishing ours first or letting it be till after the other was disposed of, I would therefore consult your convenience in regard to time. I suppose, however, that two or three controversies in progress at the same time with different individuals of different denominations, is no uncommon, nor perhaps inconvenient thing for you to get along with. I do not care about commencing the publication in the columns of the Magazine & Advocate till such time as that from which it can be regularly continued onward, without any very *long* interval till finished. If you will be ready to resume the discussion immediately, as I hope you may—though it will take several weeks to get the articles already published and my reply to your last before our readers in readiness for you to respond—I will without further delay commence. You will oblige us by an exchange of papers, as we shall both doubtless like to see what is said by the other side during the pending of the discussion.

Your early answer to this, either by letter or in the pages of the Harbinger (if you send it to us) will greatly oblige,

Dear sir,

Your obt. servt.

D. SKINNER.

Rev. A. Campbell.

BETHANY, Nov. 29th, 1836.

DEAR SIR,

Your favor of the 14th inst. was received per our last mail, and I hasten to reply. I am just now, as you have learned, engaged in a very important discussion of the Roman Catholic claims and pretensions, which will call me hence to Cincinnati the first week of January next, and will likely engross my whole attention to the first of February following.

Under these circumstances it would be injudicious to divert my attention to another subject, and therefore I must postpone the discussion which you have proposed till after that period.

Touching the propositions to which you allude on the part of Mr. Montgomery, I have to observe, that, in addition to your name, he gave

Digitized by Google

me those of Messrs. Balfour and Ballou in Boston, and some others. I did not stop in Utica, owing to fatigue of much speaking. But while in Boston I took occasion to intimate to Mr. Balfour (to whom I had an introduction while visiting the book-stores for the purpose of purchasing his books) that I thought the questions at issue between him and other Christians had not yet been fully or fairly discussed—that I had just read the discussion between Mr. Thomas of Philadelphia, and Dr. E. S. Ely, and was more fully convinced that neither of these gentlemen met the exact question fairly. Mr. Balfour observed that if I would write something on the subject, he would reply to it. I remarked that I would prefer to have a *viva voce* discussion of the whole matter, and then a publication, if necessary. He declined such a discussion, on the ground of his not being in favor of that species of controversy; and so the matter ended.

Now, sir, permit me to suggest to your consideration whether it would not be better to have such a *viva voce, face to face* discussion of the real subject at issue between us, and let some *stenographer* give it to the world. This would give more conviction, interest, and value to the matter; and it would, coming from a neutral party, or a *mere stenographer*, have more influence with the whole community.

One chief reason additional, prompting me to this course, is, your paper is *weekly*—mine is *monthly*; and we could not meet on equal footing, unless you were to suspend hostilities for three weeks at a time. Again, I may add that I could not, with propriety and justice to my engagements, give more than 12 pages octavo to the controversy—that is, 6 pages, each, per month.

However, I will do this rather than fall short of a discussion; but if, upon reflection, you would agree to meet me in Philadelphia or some central city, next spring, and have the whole matter canvassed to a point, I should think it more likely to be useful, and we should soon get through with the matter, and reach the end by a more certain, a more direct, and a more practical course.

I know that in these written, far-off, long-gun discussions, there is much sailing and generally a long voyage before we get to port. I have received so favorable an impression of your candor, ability, and erudition in all these matters, that I can the more freely communicate with you on the ways and means. I shall now, with all respect for your good sense and discretion, wait for an answer from you as soon as convenient. One reason of my naming Philadelphia, in addition to its being about equidistant and abounding in good accommodations, many Universalists living there, and having a large meeting-house, I have to attend in that city sometime next spring, in all probability (as you may learn from the accompanying number of the Harbinger I send you) in a trial pending between Dr. Sleigh and myself.

Digitized by Google

An early answer upon all these points will be thankfully received by, dear sir,

Your obt. servt.

A. CAMPBELL.

UTICA, Dec. 23, 1836.

Dear Sir,

Your favor of the 28th ult. in answer to mine of the 14th is just received, for which you have my thanks. Your reasons for delaying the contemplated discussion till February next are sufficient and satisfactory to me.

I was aware that Mr. Montgomery had mentioned other names of Universalist preachers to you besides mine; but was informed that, provided you did not succeed in starting a discussion while at Boston, either oral or written, then the alternative was that the written discussion already commenced should be continued between you and myself, in yours and some Universalist paper.

You now suggest, as another alternative, the holding of a *viva voce* discussion at Philadelphia, and employing a stenographer to take it down for publication, &c. As one reason for this preference you mention that, as our paper is *weekly* and yours *monthly*, we could not meet on equal footing in a written discussion, unless I were to suspend hostilities for three weeks at a time. This, sir, I should expect to do, provided I occupied as much space in one number of our paper as you did in one number of yours; but as one number of yours is equal to three or four of ours, you could in a particular emergency, occupy much more room in one number than it would be possible for me to do in one number of ours; so that I should be under the necessity, did I occupy equal space with you, of dividing my articles, and filling two or more numbers of ours, (i. e. what was not necessarily occupied with other matter) in reply to one number of yours. However, I do not apprehend that *its general* one article and the rejoinder to it will occupy more than twelve pages of the Harbinger. In some few instances it may, and then it could be divided into two numbers, unless you could spare more room than that at a time; and I should in such case have to divide it into still smaller divisions.

I should agree with Mr. Balfour in preferring a written to an oral discussion, inasmuch as the former is in my view the fairest method of eliciting truth, and would probably be the freest from personalities, from passion, and from rash, hasty, and inconsiderate remarks; and would certainly be most likely to obtain the true import and meaning of words in any *critical verbal investigations*. It is true that each mode of discussion has its advantages and its disadvantages. But for the above reasons, I shall decide, as you have left the alternative with me, in favor of the *written discussion;* and shall accordingly commence the publication of the articles in the Harbinger in the columns of the Magazine and Advocate some time in January, so that my reply to your last article will come out somewhere between the 1st and middle of February.

If, however, after we have carried on the written discussion to our hearts' content, or to our mutual satisfaction, you are still desirous of an oral discussion, I think I can safely guaranty that you shall be gratified. I have no doubt that Mr. Thomas of Philadelphia would gladly meet you in public debate. If he will not, I think I can find one who will, and who would at least be as acceptable to you and the public as myself. But if not, I will myself consent to meet you at any time and place where we can mutually make it convenient.

Yours with all due respect,

D. SKINNER.

Rev. A. Campbell.

P. S. After the publication of the discussion is commenced, I will, in order to facilitate its progress and prevent any unnecessary delay, send you the copy of my articles in *proof* before the issuing of the paper, and wish you to send me yours in like manner. D. S.

Digitized by Google

Neophyte's Department.

IGNORANT QUESTIONS.

I was much pleased the other day with some remarks upon the subject of Questions, which I observed in an able treatise upon the Philosophy of Human Knowledge, by A. B. Johnson. This acute writer makes some very proper distinctions between words and things; and while he labors to show that language can do no more than refer us to that which has a sensible existence, he traces with much accuracy the subtle delusions of language, and shows the folly of verbal controversies.

As young converts, particularly, are often harassed by impertinent and untaught questions upon the subject of religion, it becomes a matter of some importance to ascertain and state what constitutes an unscriptural or foolish question. And this is the more necessary since there is nothing against which Christians are more frequently and forcibly warned in the apostolic writings.

Upon the general subject, however, I beg leave to quote a few passages from the author I have mentioned:—

"Notions, in relation to philosophy even so vague, are found, not with the illiterate only, but with the learned; and hence the absurdities which are frequently dignified with the title of philosophy. The whole proceeds from an ignorance of the nature of questions; from not knowing what to inquire after, and what answer to be satisfied with.

"I hope you recollect that in the progress of our lectures I taught that language can effect no more than refer us to phenomena. This position will enable us to see that every question is insignificant when it does not inquire after some sensible existence. If I should ask what is the shape of a taste, or the color of a sound, every person would exclaim against the inanity of the questions; but the only cause of their insignificance is that they inquire after no sensible phenomenon. Every interrogation which possesses a similar defect is equally trifling.

"Children employ such questions more frequently than men, and more grossly. In children the practice is deemed an exercise of laudable curiosity by persons who know as little on the subject as children. Such questions are ably ridiculed by Sterne.

Digitized by Google

'By the right use and application of the auxiliary verbs, in which,' says he, 'a child's memory should be exercised, there is no idea can enter his brain, how barren soever, but a magazine of conceptions and conclusions may be drawn from it thus: Did you ever see a white bear? Have I ever seen one? Might I ever have seen one? Am I ever to see one? Ought I ever to have seen one? Can I ever see one? If I should see a white bear, what should I say? If I should never see one, what then? Is there no sin in a white bear? Is it better than a black one?'

* * * * * * * * * * *

"The nature of questions will be better understood by investigating the nature of answers. You will recollect that words can effect no more than to refer us to phenomena; hence no answer can effect more than to refer us to phenomena. When the Lord answered, from the flaming bush the inquiry of Moses, by saying, "I am that I am," the answer was wonderfully expressive of the nature of language, which, in no instance, can effect more than it did in that. We may say to life, What art thou? and to death, What art thou? and we may address a like inquiry to every phenomenon, but language can furnish them with no better answer than, I am what I am. If we would learn more, we must seek it from our senses. They only can afford us information. Every sight, taste, feel, smell, or sound, which an object exhibits spontaneously, or which it can by any art be made to exhibit, is an item of information, whether we dignify it with a name or not; but all the names that can be invented will not increase our knowledge of phenomena. We may as well attempt to enlarge our family by multiplying the names of our children, as to increase our knowledge of phenomena, by multiplying the words that refer to them.

"What is gold? This question is asked by Locke. I answer, Gold is this which you see. But seeing informs me of nothing but the appearance. I want to know what gold is, and not how it looks. It is then this which you touch. But now you teach me how it feels only. I do not seek this information, but rather what it is which I touch. It is gold. But that is merely the name. I want not to know its name, but what that is to which we apply the name. Then I know not what you want, nor do you know. No words will accomplish more than to designate a sight, taste, feel, smell, or sound, and these are not what you desire. Your question is therefore insignificant. It is a process of language, and may be pursued interminably. Let me answer as insignificantly as you inquire, and tell you that gold is something, say A. You may immediately repeat the question, What is A? It is B. What is B? It is C. What is C? You may proceed thus, not to the end of the alphabet only, but to the end of time;

Digitized by Google

and your last question will be as pertinent as the first, for both are insignificant, if they inquire not after a sensible phenomenon.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

"What is a rainbow? What is thunder? What are the winds? What is an earthquake? It never occurs to us that the phenomena themselves are the best explication of these questions, but we immediately resort to a profusion of words. One person will say that a rainbow is a complex idea; another, that it is a reflection of the rays of light from descending rain. You may ask fifty persons what a rainbow is, and each will give a different answer. They will be astonished at each other's ignorance in not knowing what a rainbow is, and they will suspect any thing rather than that their knowledge is alike, and that they differ in language only."

Thus far Mr. Johnson: and doubtless his reasonings will commend themselves to every reflecting mind. For it must be obvious that, whatever conventional rules of language or stipulated signs of things may be agreed upon by men, all true knowledge must finally be received through the means of the senses. Hence it is that when an unknown object cannot be presented to the senses, we cannot obtain so good an idea of it in any way as by a comparison of it to something with which we are already familiar. So far as the analogy holds between them, and so far as their attributes or qualities are identical, a knowledge of the one will give us a knowledge of the other.

It is therefore in accordance with the necessities of language, and the constitution of our nature, that the Bible communicates to us information concerning unseen things, through the medium of sensible objects. Thus, gems, and pearl; gold, and precious stones; light and glory, are selected to present the splendors of the New Jerusalem: while heaven is that happy abode where there is no sin, nor sickness, nor sorrow, but fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore: and the Divine Being is himself represented as *hating* and *loving;* as *seeing* and *hearing;* as being our *Father* in heaven; a great *King*; the *Lord* of heaven and earth, seated upon a *throne*, and surrounded with the *majesty* and *insignia* of royalty. And so far as these comparisons and analogies will carry us, so far only can we advance towards things unseen. Where they stop, we must be content to remain, until faith is superseded by knowledge, and hope completed in enjoyment. At present we cannot see the glory of the Lord, nor is heaven

Digitized by Google

open to our view. We cannot yet 'know what we shall be,' nor 'can any one by searching find out God, or know the Almighty to perfection.'

Such deep research, and remote investigations are neither suited to man's capacity and circumstances, nor are they necessary to his present happiness. It is on this account that Revelation, while it presents by means of the archetypes in Nature such truths only respecting the past, the future, and the unseen things, as are absolutely requisite to enable man to recognize his duties and his relations, confines itself for the most part to those practical matters of morality and piety which are familiar to all; and the regulation of those natural powers and affections which all are conscious of possessing. It cannot be too often observed that the Bible reveals nothing for the purpose of gratifying a vain curiosity; and that in it, theoretical abstractions, and mere verbal distinctions and designations, have no place; but that, on the contrary, while it details the actual occurrences and transactions of past ages, it demands credence for truths which are no sooner uttered than they receive a responsive echo from the human heart, and for facts which have been duly attested by those who witnessed them. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," says Peter in all the confidence of a sensible demonstration which incredulity could not resist,—"but were *eye-witnesses* of his grandeur—and that voice we *heard*"—"That which we have *heard*," says John, "which we have *seen* with our eyes, which we have *contemplated*, and our hands have *handled*—we declare to you."

Now as we are wholly dependent upon the Bible for our information respecting the matters of which it treats, it is obvious that however our information may be increased in proportion as we become acquainted with the Bible, it can never be extended beyond it. And as in Nature it would be a vain thing to inquire after that which has no sensible existence, so all questions relating to religion for which the scriptures provide no answers, are both foolish and injurious. They are foolish because they can never be satisfactorily answered or disposed of. They are injurious because they lead the mind from the contemplation of the facts and truths which Revelation presents, and introduce vain

Digitized by Google

jangling instead of promoting that true piety which is the express object of all revelation. "Charge some," says Paul to Timothy, —"not to give heed to fables, and endless genealogies, which occasion disputes rather than godly edification which is through faith."—"The end of the charge is love—from which some have turned aside to foolish talking."—"Reject profane and old wives' fables, and exercise yourself to godliness."—"The form of wholesome words which you have heard from me, hold fast with the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus."—"Testifying to them in the presence of the Lord, not to fight about words for nothing useful but to the subverting of the hearers."—"Profane empty babblings resist, for they will increase to more ungodliness."—"Foolish and ignorant questions reject, knowing that they beget contentions."

"When insignificant questions are propounded," observes Mr. Johnson, "it is well to ask the querist what he is inquiring after. In this way I have disconcerted many profound interrogatories. The moment a person knows not what he is inquiring after, his question is assuredly insignificant to himself."

All questions, then, for which the scriptures furnish no answers, are vain, unprofitable, and ignorant, and should never be answered. Why should they? If answered, the answer must of course correspond with the question; and if the question be foolish and ignorant, so will be the answer. U

DEFECTION OF THE BIBLE CHRISTIANS.

SYDNEY, *Ohio*, December 20th, 1836.

Dear Sir,

I CANNOT but approve your proposed course in the next series of the Harbinger, in reference to the defection of the so called Christian Body, and their opposition to the New Testament and its friends. As subservient to your design, and as auxiliary in a reformation that every rea and intelligent friend to prosperity and truth must greatly desire to see progressing, I now send you this communication.

A certain Mr. F— delivered, in this town, a discourse from Matthew xxviii. 19, 20. Now this Mr. F— is a preacher of the "Christian" deno-

Digitized by Google

mination, and professes to be "specially and supernaturally called, qualified and sent to preach the *everlasting gospel.*" He commenced his sermon by vindicating the authority of Jesus Christ to call and commission his Apostles and send them to preach his gospel to the Nations, and showing that he endued them with power to confirm and sustain their pretensions. After taking it for granted by all, that the Apostles were called, &c. he then proceeded to prove, or try to prove, that others were divinely called and sent as well as they, to preach the "everlasting gospel." To sustain this position, he told us of Timothy 'who was called and qualified by the Almighty to the work of the ministry.' Whereupon I put my wits to work to reconcile his *ipse dixit* in this case, (for he asserted only,) with Paul's account of it. 1 Tim. iv, 14. "*Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was* GIVEN *thee by* PROPHECY, *with the* LAYING ON OF THE HANDS *of the* PRESBYTERY." Also, 1 Tim. i. 18. "*This charge* I COMMIT UNTO THEE, *son Timothy, according to the* PROPHECIES *which went before on thee.*" And 3 Tim. i. 13. "*Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard from* ME."

Mr. F— thinks that God must yet call, in a special or miraculous way, certain persons to preach; for Jesus has commanded his disciples to pray the Lord to send forth more laborers into the harvest; for the harvest is great and the laborers are few. 'Now, says he, if the Lord sends these laborers, then I will pray to the Lord; but if the church has to send them, then our prayers should be addressed to the church.' He appeared not to know that this prayer had been already answered by the Lord of the harvest in the mission of the twelve Apostles, (compare Matth. ix. 38. and x. 1, 2,) and in that of the Seventy, (Luke x. 1, 2, 3.) Nor did it suit his purpose to notice that the Lord *always* gave his 'call to preach' in an *audible voice*, (Matth. x. 1, Luke ix. 3; Acts xxvi. 14, 17.) and endowed his truly "called and sent" ministers with such miraculous powers and credentials as no one could dispute. And he seemed also ignorant that when the *eight or ten thousand disciples* which composed the church at Jerusalem were scattered abroad, "they went every where preaching the word." Acts viii. 1, 4.

But again, Rom. x. 13—15 inclusive. Here the Apostle propounds four interrogatives, which may be considered as so many affirmative propositions. After affirming the salvation of those who call on the name of the Lord, he then says, 'None can call on him until they believe on him—none can believe until they hear—none can hear without a preacher—none can preach except they are sent.' Now, the Apostles were sent, were qualified or endued with power from on high: see Luke xxiv. 49. and Acts i. 4. Therefore they could preach, for they were by the Holy Spirit taught *what* to preach. But *we* get our knowledge of the truth by consulting the Prophets and Apostles. Take these from the world and how would any one know what to preach? With these, and

Digitized by Google

who is it that cannot preach, if he has the gift of utterance? If such special communications are indispensable to sermonizing, how is it that so many wicked men can deliver such excellent discourses? Does God call wicked men to preach "the everlasting gospel?"

He then gave us his account of the qualifications of a preacher, namely, 'conversion to God—regeneration—faith—a new heart—a desire for the salvation of mankind—an irresistible impression of duty to preach, &c.' and then told us that he had no fellowship for a man as a preacher, unless he professed, believed in, and could give such evidence of his being called to preach. Thus placing himself and other "called and sent" ministers, with the holy Apostles of our Lord, (modestly however excepting inspiration,) he then proceeded to tell us what these specially called ministers were and are to teach—"They are to teach the whole revelation of God"—that is, Teach all nations the whole revelation of God, baptizing them, &c. and then "teach them all things whatsoever I have commanded you" to teach. Here I had to think of my Greek Testament, in which I read MATHETEUSATE, *disciple* or *convert* all nations, *teaching* (DIDASKONTES) them, &c. But as he does not profess to understand the original, I could excuse him in this particular.

He made a prodigious effort to prove that baptism was not for the remission of sins. He tried hard to make it appear that "Peter did not mean that baptism was for the remission of sins," although he said so. He contended that "remission of sins cannot be dependent upon baptism," inasmuch as baptism requires the act of "a second person to put him into the water. Then," said he, "if a person could not get some person to immerse him, the poor sinner must go to hell for the want of baptism." Here my mind reverted to Mr. F's use of Rom. x. 13—15. In this I am taught that no one can believe unless he first hears the gospel. Now suppose a poor sinner to whom no one would preach in order to faith: then he must be damned without remedy; therefore faith cannot be indispensable or essential to salvation or remission of sins. If such an argument is worth any thing to Mr. F—, it is worth just the same to me. These seem to be parallel cases. Are they not, Mr. Editor?

Mr. F— said that Peter could not have meant that baptism was for the remission of sins; for he (Peter) said in his first epistle iii. 21. that baptism did not put away the filth of the flesh. This filth of the flesh, Mr. F. explained to be the *sins* of the flesh. Well, Peter, thinks I, you are betrayed into a sad contradiction. By the putting away the filth of the flesh, I had previously understood you to have reference to the Jewish washings, by which the flesh, not the conscience, was purified; and that you enjoined 'baptism for remission,' (Acts ii. 38.) and declared that baptism doth save us,' (1 Pet. iii. 21.) because by baptism into Jesus Christ we enjoy forgiveness, and through this assurance of pardon obtain a good conscience.

Digitized by Google

To prove that Peter did not mean literally what he said on Pentecost, he quoted Luke, chapter xiv. 26. "Except a man *hate* his father," &c. &c. "he cannot be my disciple." Now if I have not been wrongly informed in reference to ancient usage, the word *hate* here literally means to love in a less degree. This injunction, then, is correctly regarded when we love our Father, &c. in a less degree than the Lord. For this is the literal import thereof.

Mr. F— told us that Peter said Paul had written or said many things hard to understand, and that he thought Peter had also said many things hard to understand, and he supposed Peter's answer to the penitents on Pentecost was of that character. This last argument in its intended bearing is quite the reverse of what the Christian teachers have ever maintained. If Mr. F's arguments are correct, then perhaps all the scriptures are hard to understand, and do not mean what they say. This last idea was first preached in Eden by the serpent to our first parents, and well becomes "false apostles," "deceitful workers," "who transform themselves into apostles of Christ,"—and who wish to keep up their own importance, and establish a spiritual despotism over the people of the Lord.

He contended that faith in the scriptural sense, joined with repentance, qualifies a person for baptism. But what is faith in the scriptural sense? Here I began to muster up my wits again. Faith in the scriptural, the classic, and every good sense, means the mind's perception of a fact sustained by testimony. The Christian's faith is a firm conviction that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. But what is the value of faith *alone?* I read that the devils believe and tremble—and they confessed him too; "We know thee," &c. Then why were they not saved or pardoned? Because to them the word of salvation was not sent, and they did not love and obey. Ah! that's the great secret of the sinner's condemnation. So, then, when a man believes, he must repent; and when he repents, what then? Confess. Well, but the demons *said*, "We know thee." Were they saved? No. What then? 'They have not obeyed the gospel.' (Rom. x. 16.) Well now we have it: "Ye have purified your souls by obeying the truth, through the Spirit." Men must believe, repent, and confess by OBEYING the truth. The believing penitent then must be baptized; for this is the first act of obedience after faith and repentance. But Mr. F's scriptural sense seems to be, as well as I can tell it, this: A preacher must first be called; he preaches; his labors are attended by the Holy Spirit; a person is under conviction, and understands that he is the chief of sinners; he becomes very sorry for his sins; he calls on the name of the Lord, and thus he is saved—his sins are all forgiven. He is then commanded by Peter to repent and be baptized because his sins are forgiven. Come, Christians, look to your ways, and search the scriptures. Have you repented because your sins are forgiven?

Digitized by Google

Mr. F—, I suppose, suspecting the disapprobation of some to his preaching his "*sentiments*" instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ, gave us his reason for doing so; namely, "I see," said he, "the sword coming, and I must warn the people; for woe is me if I preach not the gospel." He should have said *my sentiments* to have been consistent, for he told us in the onset that he was going to preach his sentiments. What "sword," thinks I, and what "wo?" I soon conceived an answer: it was this—It is becoming evident to the community that no one is specially called to preach, and that baptism was designed for remission of sins. This is the sword. Then, should this be universally received as true, the people will not look up to the *professedly* called and sent ministers, and they shall bear the imputation of being wrong. This I interpret to be the anticipated and much dreaded woe. For one of these Reverends to be considered nothing superior to the laity is quite humiliating, and such a loss of dignity would be a woful matter. But I hope the time is drawing nigh when even in this section of country the people will not be hoodwinked any longer with such clerical imposition. The pure gospel, or the gospel unmixed with human sophistry, is beginning to catch the breeze of public notice in these parts, and the called and sent ones are taking the alarm; but in spite of all their warnings, I hope, and indeed I think, that it will continue to advance, and finally triumph over all their efforts. Their opposition to it is but bringing it into greater notice, and will result in giving it the greater celerity. The clumsy flail with which they aim such furious blows against those who are determined, by the help of the Lord, to know the whole truth, only descends upon their own heads.

It is reported, and credibly attested, that at a several days meeting near this, a brother S. was prohibited, by the ministers present, from preaching, only because he is of the Reformers. Also, at W. L., a Reformer from Kentucky was in the same manner, and for the same reason, prohibited. Both of those churches are of the "old Christian Body," so called. At the first named meeting the brethren interfered in favor of brother S. Did you ever know of greater bigotry and sectarianism among any of the sectaries in Christendom? Indeed, through the vehemence of their zeal against what they ignorantly call *Campbellism*, they are carried away from the first principles of the Christian church into the veriest and most decided partyism.

The writer has reason for not giving his true name, unless circumstances of importance require it; then it shall be forthcoming. Meanwhile let me bear the name of an impartial, and at the same time candid and sincere

LISTENER.

Alexander Campbell, Bethany, Va.

Digitized by Google

Prophetic Department.

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the morning-star arise in your hearts." 2 Pet. i. 19.

THE PROPHECIES.—*NO. II.*

Prophecy III.—"I WILL make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and *in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*" Gen. xii. 2, 3. "Unto thy seed will I give this land." ver. 7. "I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." xiii. 16. "Tell the stars if thou be able to number them; *so shall thy seed be.*" xvi. 5. "Thou shalt be a father of many nations: kings shall come out of thee. In an everlasting covenant I shall be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee. I will establish my covenant with Isaac for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him." Gen. xvii. 6, 7, 19. "*In Isaac shall thy seed be called.*" Genesis xxi. 12.

These predictions, with others to the same effect, on the same subject, delivered at sundry interviews with Abraham, are so very simple and perspicuous that they have been universally understood in one and the same sense. The events have so exactly interpreted them, that we quote them as illustrative of one great point in prophecy—that its perspicuity and intelligibility is always in the ratio of its utility to mankind.

The repetitions of these promises and prophecies to Isaac and Jacob need not a separate notice. Though distinct annunciations, they are declarative of one and the same great event, viz.—that *God would by the seed of Abraham, by the seed of Isaac, and by the seed of Jacob, bless all the families of the earth.* The nature, extent, and circumstances of this blessing are reserved for further revelations.

Prophecy IV.—Thy seed shall be a stranger in a foreign land, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years. And also that nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterwards shall they come out with great substance. In the fourth generation they shall come hither again." Genesis xv. 13, 14, 16.

This prophecy concerning the temporal circumstances of the natural descendants of Abraham, is by no means so perspicuous as those concerning the seed by whom all the families of the earth are to be blessed. It is, indeed, of much value, however, as furnishing data for a more certain system of interpretation. The accomplishment of this predic-

Digitized by Google

tion assures us that Egypt is the foreign land intimated, and the slavery of the Israelites the affliction spoken of. The judgment of Pharaoh and the spoils carried with the emancipated Israelites are the unequivocal fulfilment of other items expressed. But concerning the time how long, and some other circumstances, there is a difficulty, which, without the accomplishment, would not have been very easily interpreted.

Four hundred years is the period of affliction, and yet they are to come out in the *fourth generation!* But the history of the events will not give much more than half of that period of affliction. From the day that Jacob went down into Egypt until the exodus, was only two hundred and fifteen years; for the whole sojourning from the calling of Abraham to the deliverance under Moses, is set down at four hundred and thirty years, (Exodus xii. 40.) and is so quoted in an argument by Paul, Gal. iii. 17. It was four hundred and thirty years from the promise of blessing all nations in the seed of Abraham to the giving of the law three months after the exodus. Now as the promise was made to Abraham in his 75th year on his becoming a *sojourner* in a strange land, it was fitting for Moses to say, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel (not in Egypt,) but *who dwelt in Eypt*, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." Ex. xii. 40, 42.

Now that they could have been but two hundred and fifteen years in Egypt is evident from the following facts.—

Abraham was 75 years old when the promise was made to him concerning his seed.

Isaac was born in his 100th year; in the year of his sojourning	25
Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born. Gen. xxv. 26.	60
Jacob with his family went down into Egypt in his 130th year. Gen. xlvii. 9.	130
The sojourning in Egypt then was,	215
In all,	430

Now as four hundred years is the time mentioned in the prophecy before us, it specially refers to *his seed* sojourning, which, from the birth of Isaac, would be three hundred and ninety-five, or the round sum of four hundred years. But the difficulty with the majority, who suppose a *generation* and a *hundred years* to be equivalent, is, How could they go out of affliction in the fourth generation and be afflicted four hundred years? The solution is easy, and also very valuable because it clears up the whole prophecy. It is a literal generation and a literal four

Digitized by Google

hundred years. Moses, and Aaron, and Caleb were literally the *fourth* generation from their fathers, Jacob's sons who went down into Egypt: [see Exodus vi. 16, 18, 10, and 1 Chronicles ii. 4, 5, 9, 18.] They were then brought out in the fourth generation, which happens to be only two hundred and fifteen years from the time that *Levi* went down into Egypt. Levi was the father of Kohath; Kohath was the father of Amram; and Amram was the father of Moses the fourth in descent from Levi.

This then limits the grievous affliction to the two hundred and fifteen years in Egypt, and gives to the four hundred years the whole sojourning from the birth of Isaac. Thence back to the promise of blessing all nations, completes the whole period of four hundred and thirty years. Hence Paul argues from a very important fact, that the promise of blessing all nations is four hundred and thirty years older than the law; consequently the law cannot vacate a covenant of blessings so much more ancient than itself, and also confirmed by the Lawgiver himself.

From this comparison between sacred history and prophecy, we see that it is necessary to take all the points into consideration to be certain that we are right in any one of them; and also that it behooves to subject all the parts of the same prophecy to the same principle of interpretation; that if one branch of the prediction be taken literally, all the other parts of the same branch must be interpreted in the same way.

We are moreover taught from this very important prophecy, not to be too rigid in ascribing to any subject of prophecy during the whole period of its existence, all the attributes that may belong to it at some particular time: for in the case before us, of the whole term they were only sorely afflicted for a short period, although they were all the time in a strange land, and pilgrims too, without any fixed residence.

We may learn another lesson from the accomplishment of this prophecy—that a nation may be said to be judged and punished for its crimes by temporal calamities, and when its government is plagued and broken to pieces. For thus did God specially judge Egypt in this instance. So dangerous is it to tread on human rights!

Prophecy V.—"Ishmael shall be a wild man: his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren." Gen. xvi. 12. "I will make him a great nation." Gen. xvii. 20. Gen. xxi. 18. "He dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer." ver. 20.

Here is another very plain and unfigurative prophecy. It was spoken almost four thousand years ago. It has stood in the Hebrew language about three thousand four hundred years; it has been in the Greek two thousand one hundred years, and thence passed into almost every

Digitized by Google

tongue; and Ishmael still dwells in the wilderness, wild and indomitable as ever. "Many potentates among the Abyssinians, Persians, Egyptians, and Turks, have undertaken to subjugate the wandering or wild Arabs. They have all ultimately failed. Sesostris, Cyrus, Pompey, and Trajan, all endeavored, but in vain, to conquer Arabia. The country which these wild Ishmaelites inhabit stretches from Aleppo to the Arabian sea, and from Egypt to the Persian Gulf; a tract of land not less than 1800 miles in length, by 900 in breadth." The most admirable attribute of this prediction is its bold, free, and full description of the destiny of a single family for thousands of years. History is not more explicit in its details than is this prediction in the full portraiture of the standing, character, and unchanging fortunes of the son of Hagar.

Prophecy VI.—THE DREAMS OF JOSEPH. "We were binding sheaves in the field; and lo! my sheaf arose and also stood upright; and behold your sheaves stood round about, and made obeisance to my sheaf."—"Behold I have dreamed a dream more; and behold the sun, and the moon, and the eleven stars made obeisance to me." Gen. xxxvii. 7, 9.

The dreams are certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

Observe, 1st. The same event or events may be viewed in different attitudes, and appropriately set forth under different imagery, as in the case of the eleven *sheaves* and eleven *stars*.

2d. The same event may, under one class of images, be more fully set forth than under another. Thus the sun and moon are superadded to the eleven sheaves, in the second dream.

3d. Dreams and visions are, we see, more picturesque and figurative than simple prediction.

4th. There is a natural appropriateness in the sacred imagery to express the objects presented. Thus the *sheaves bowing* to Joseph's sheaf, bears an allusion to bread, which was the cause of the obeisance here noticed, and indicates the subjection of the *eleven* brothers. In the second the glory of Joseph is the prime idea. The glorious luminaries, namely, the sun, moon, and *the* eleven stars, (rationally supposed to be the signs in the Zodiac, because noticed as far back as history reaches,) beautifully set forth the dignities of the fathers and luminaries of Israel.

5. Because of the frequency of this imagery, it is worthy of notice here, that the sun is the symbol of the highest potentate; the moon, of the next in power; the stars of illustrious magnitude, of the nobles of a people.

These prophetic dreams reached no farther than the then existing generation, and portrayed the fortunes of the patriarchs only so far as respected their descent into Egypt.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Digitized by Google

SKETCHES OF RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

QUAKERS OR FRIENDS.

This denomination which made its appearance in England about the middle of the seventeenth century, under the public ministrations of George Fox and others, has not escaped the influences of that spirit of inquiry and revolution which has, of late years, so materially changed the religious and political condition of the world. Originating in a period of almost universal delinquency and vice; when luxury and dissipation had taken the place of frugality and temperance, and a vain show of pompous ceremonies was substituted for true religion; the society of Friends proposed but few articles of faith, dwelt mostly on morality, and preached mutual charity and the love of God, and a deep attention to the inward motions of the spirit. Their sobriety of deportment; their simplicity of manners and of worship, and their conscientious adherence to principles of conduct so nearly resembling those of the ancient Christians, and so far in advance of the age which gave them birth, exposed them for a time to much persecution, until the iron age of bigotry and oppression gave place in some measure to the milder reign of liberty and human rights.

While, however, they have been thus in advance of the most civilized portions of society, in the simplicity of their habits and in the practical duties of benevolence and philanthropy, their peculiar views of the Christian religion have been in advance, not only of Christianity itself, but of the present state of existence; so that they unfortunately preferred the feeble illumination of the "light within them," to the steady brilliancy of the scriptures of truth, and abolished those outward ordinances and emblems of the gospel, which the Divine Spirit has adapted to the present constitution of human nature, as the means of spiritual instruction and enjoyment.

It was by carrying out this fundamental doctrine of Quakerism to a greater length than usual, but perhaps no further than to its legitimate issue, that Elias Hicks occasioned, of late years, an extensive schism in this society. His ultra-spiritualism led him not only to insist with greater emphasis upon the subordinate and inferior value of the scriptures, and the supreme excellency, authority, and certainty of the dictates of the "internal word," or spiritual Christ within; but to deny, like the ancient Gnostics, that Christ has come in the flesh, endeavoring to show that Christ was a purely spiritual Being, wholly distinct from that "Living Word" which says John, 'our eyes have seen and our hands have handled.'

The chief opposers of this heresy, among whom one of the ablest and most devoted was a member called Elisha Bates, have been led, on the other hand, to pay a greater regard to the scriptures, and to seek a more perfect conformity to their requirements. The consequence has been that a number of most amiable, intelligent, and influential members have acknowledged the necessity and importance of water baptism, to which ordinance, (or to some of its perversions) they have submitted, and are now beginning to be distinguished by the title of "Evangelical Quakers." As a specimen of their regard for the word of truth and inspiration, and an expose of their views and principles, I beg leave to submit the following interesting extracts from the "Miscellaneous Repository" for 9th month (September,) 1836, published at St. Clairsville, Ohio. They form part of an "Address to the Members of the Society of Friends," by Elisha Bates, Editor of the Repository.

R. R.

"I hold it as a maxim, that every religious society is bound most thoroughly and practically, to acknowledge the authority of the scriptures, and therein to admit the principle of *reformation*; by the correction of all mistakes, and the removal of all corruptions which may be found among them. And there is undoubtedly a call at the present time, in every religious society,

Digitized by Google

for such a recurrence to this *True Standard of Faith and Practice*. Christ loved his church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, by the washing of water by the Word, and present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. "His fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner: but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

"The awakening which is now going on not only in Christendom, but also in heathen countries, unsettling the various classes of men from a blind implicit confidence in the systems to which they have been accustomed, bears evident marks of the work of a divine hand. It is like the shaking of the *wheat* in the process of cleansing, that the dust and chaff may be separated from that which is valuable.——

"Truth admits of no mixture of error. Mix up the most substantial truths with errors on the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and the compound, if it be not allowed to be separated into its elements, is fatal heresy. He that denies that Jesus is the Christ, whatever he professes beside, comes under the most awful denunciations. "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

"There is a great difference, however, between mistakes ignorantly made, and the same errors persisted in, after the danger has been shown. But now, after all the consequences which we have seen, we are thrown back on the very same ground from which we supposed we had advanced towards primitive Christianity. The whole mass of the writings of early Friends is claimed to be the Standard of doctrines to us—the depository of the true meaning of the scriptures, and is raised up as a barrier, beyond which we must not pass in search of the doctrines of religion. And the deep sufferings of our forefathers are brought into remembrance to awaken our tender sympathies, to counteract the adoption of the simple doctrines of Christianity, as delivered by our blessed Lord and his Apostles.

"Dare we for a moment put our *peculiar* views in competition with Christianity; and appeal to the sympathies of our nature, or the veneration for our ancestors, to turn the scale against the Lord Jesus?

"I speak with freedom of the imperfections of our own writings in general terms. I wish not to descend to particulars any further than necessity shall demand. But so much has already been said on particular cases, as to show the necessity of recurring to scripture doctrine. Believing, as I do, that the Bible contains a clear and plain record of every thing of a general nature, pertaining to Faith and Practice, which is essential to salvation, and that the immediate teaching of the Holy Spirit

Digitized by Google

will lead to a full reception of those doctrines, and give us an enlightened, and experimental understanding of them, and write them in our hearts—I earnestly desire that we may bring all our doctrines and practices to that standard, to be tried by it, freely rejecting whatever is not according to its testimony, and as freely receiving every thing which may have been improperly rejected.

"The government of Christ in his church, is by the established record of Faith and Practice, in the Scriptures, and by the immediate work and guidance of the Spirit, in accordance with that record. Whatever church sets up its own authority, regardless of the established laws of Him who is given to be head over all things to the church, casts off the government of Christ; and whatever it may have been, becomes a spurious church. The claim to infallibility is one of awful presumption. And the assumption of *feeling* as the rule of action, independent of the revealed will of God, is direct rejection of the government of Christ in his church.

"But the fearful character of this procedure is greatly increased when that *independent feeling* is claimed and exercised for the suppression of those doctrines which were taught by Christ himself, and especially that blessed doctrine of faith in Him, and justification by faith. Can we conceive any thing more awful than that a society, proceeding coolly, deliberately, and perseveringly on this assumption of *feeling*—should extirpate those blessed doctrines from within their borders, by crushing one after another, those who hold them?

"How striking is that charge which was given by the Lord Jesus, when he declared, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," and concluding in these words, "teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." How can we expect his gracious promises, but in the way of his holy commandments.

"The Lord Almighty is calling for a pure and sanctified people, to be conformed to the gospel of his Son. We must individually seek to be transformed by the renewing of the mind. By the power of the Holy Spirit we must be made willing to give up every thing which is contrary to the will of God; and with repentance, and turning unto God, we must lay hold of the blessed hope which is set before us through faith in Christ—and earnestly endeavor to come up in an humble obedience to his commandments; that, being justified by his grace, we may be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. And thus obeying from the heart that form of doctrine which has been delivered unto us, we may unite in building up the society according to

Digitized by Google

the pattern of the apostolic church; that the language may be strictly applicable to us, "This people have I formed for myself. They shall show forth my praise."

"Let the scriptures be received as the record of the will of God. Let our opinions, our practices, our writings, and our assemblies, be brought to conform to their decision without an appeal to any other authority whatever. Let the word of the Lord have free course and be glorified, and let all persecutions on account of it be *stayed*. Can it be expected that a war which is waging against the blessed doctrines of Jesus Christ, can prosper? The longer that war is protracted, the more your troubles will increase. The more rapidly any may urge it on, the sooner will he that is almighty bring about their utter confusion." pp. 443, 447, 448.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Le Litterateur Francais.—This is a weekly French paper, of four quarto pages, lately commenced at Boston, and edited by M. W. H. S. Jordan, Washington street, No. 121. Terms, $2,00 in advance, or $2,50 at the end of the year. It is very neatly executed, and the excellence and variety of its articles from the best French writers, entitle it to the patronage of those who are learning the French, or who are already familiar with this beautiful language.

The Northern Reformer, Heretic Detector, and Evangelical Review. Such are the titles of a publication by brother A. Crihfield of Middleburg, Ohio. It is to be issued quarterly, each number containing 96 pages 12mo., at $1,00 per annum. Contents of No. I:—Preface; Addresses to the Unconverted, No. 1; Universalism Detected, No. 1; Baptism; Progress of Reform; M. Winans on Opinions; Universalism Detected, No. 2; The Ten Commandments; Word and Spirit; Sceptical Objections, No. 1; Resurrection—B. F. Hall; Protestant Methodism Fears, &c.; Orthodox Quakerism; The Baptism of John; Methodism, a Heresy; Holy Spirit—M. Winans; Baptism of John; Progress of Discussion; David S. Burnet; Notice; Query Answered.

The Lord's Christ and his Gospel explained.—A pamphlet of 16 pages 8vo., bearing the above title, has been lately received from St. Heliers in the Isle of Jersey. It has been published, as we learn from accompanying documents, under the auspices of a Christian Church assembling for worship at St. Heliers. Its object is to define the nature of Christ, who is supposed by the author to be the 'Spirit, Life, or Soul of God manifested in the flesh;' and to exhibit the leading facts and principles of the gospel; among which the imputed righteousness of Christ, and his actual descent into hell are made to occupy the most prominent place. While we are sorry to perceive by this pamphlet a disposition to indulge in *mere verbal* disquisitions; and to descant with too great precision upon those deep and mysterious themes, to do justice to which, both human language and human intellect are inadequate; and regret that some points of a speculative character, and some minutiæ which belong to the chapter of *opinions*, are too strongly insisted on; we are happy to find that our brethren in Jersey and Guernsey are blessed with a knowledge of the cardinal principles of the gospel, and are keeping the ordinances as they have been delivered by the Apostles of our blessed Lord.

The following are the concluding paragraphs of the pamphlet in question which relate to the order of the church:—

Digitized by Google

"The gospel having been commanded to be made known to all nations for the obedience of faith, beginning at Jerusalem, I shall now conclude by showing how the Apostles taught the primitive Christians to worship and serve God, keeping the ordinances of divine service as they were delivered unto them by command of Christ: that all walking by the same rule, and minding the same thing loving one another for the truth's sake that dwelt in them, there should be no divisions among them. See Eph. iv. 8—16.

Having been all baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, some by the Apostles, and the rest by the brethren through whom they were brought to the knowledge of the truth, they of every place came together in each others houses every Lord's day evening, which was the first day of the week, at 6 o'clock; that being the hour that Christ and his Apostles met to break bread in the beginning; (see Luke xxii. 7—20; John xiii. 21—30; xx. 19, 26; Acts ii. 15 ii. 37—47; xx. 7, 8; 1 Cor. iv. 16, 17; xi.) but not to the exclusion of unbelievers, and such as came to see their order, not being yet brought under the power of the word, for whom preparation was made apart from the church before the hour of assembling. (See Acts ii. 44—47; v. v. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 23—25; 2 Cor. vi. 14—18.) And being all assembled together, and seated around the Lord's table, taking their Chief Bishop and his Apostles as an example, one of the elder brethren ministering at the table of the Lord, (for which he received no money, see 1 Pet. v. 1—4,) they commenced the divine service by breaking bread, (that is, by eating the Lord's supper) to show forth the Lord's death as his witnesses. (1 Cor. xi. 17—34.) After which, he who ministered at the Lord's table read parts of the Old and New Scriptures aloud, and spake to the edification, exhortation, and comfort of the whole church, assisted by other gifted brethren. (See 1 Cor. xiv; Col. iv. 16; Acts xiii. 14, 15.) Then a collection was made for the poor saints, and for to defray the expenses of the feast. (See John xiii. 29; 1 Cor. xvi. 1—4; 2 Cor. viii. ix.) And having afterwards united in prayer, one of the brethren praying aloud, they concluded the divine service by singing an hymn. (See John xvii, xviii, i; Matth. xxvi. 30.) No man doing what was right in his eyes; but as the Lord commanded by his Apostles. (See Acts i. 1—3; Matth. xxviii. 16—20; 1 Cor xiv 37.) For so it was written, 'I will give them one heart, and one way; and it shall be called, The way of holiness: the unclean shall not pass over it; but the redeemed of the Lord shall walk therein. For I will put my Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in my statutes, and to keep my ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God.'

As it was in the beginning, so it should be unto the end of the world: for the priesthood being changed, there was made of necessity a change also of the law: and they who believe are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ. (See Ps. lxxxix. 15—33; 1 Cor. ix. 21; Acts xxiv. 14.) Therefore, taking the churches of God which in Judea were in Christ Jesus for an ensample, (1 Thess ii. 13, 14.) they who are sanctified in Christ Jesus should come out, and be separate from all unbelievers; (that is, from the religious assemblies of all who are yet in their sins, see Prov. xxx. 12.) not believing that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh through the Spirit, by which he suffered the death of the cross, was buried, descended into hell, and rose again on the third day, for the redemption and justification of sinners; (see 1 Cor. xv. 1—4; Eph iv. 9, 10; Acts ii. 22—32; 1 Tim. i. 15, 16: iii. 16; John viii. 21—24.) walking together in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost; building up one another on their most holy faith. (See Phil. i. 27—30; Jude.) Thus making a difference between clean and unclean, holy and profane, as the Lord hath commanded. (See Lev. x. 8—11; 2 Cor. vi. 14—18, vii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 14—16.) And so an entrance shall be ministered unto them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To whom be glory, both now and forever. Amen. Heb. x. 25—39; 1 John i. 5—7; 2 John 9—11; Matth. vii. 13—28."

Common School Assistant—Eight quarto pages, monthly; edited by J. Orville Taylor; Albany, N. Y.; 50 cents per annum. This is a neatly executed paper, intended for the improvement of common school education. From the ability with which it is conducted it is likely to render essential benefit to the important cause to which it is devoted. The following persons will furnish articles for the paper during the coming year:—Dr. Beck, President of the Albany Academy; Gideon Hawley, Esq. former Superintendent of Common Schools; Dr. Nott, President of Union College; Professor Porter of Union College, and Governor Everett of Massachusetts. Assistance is also expected from the pens of Miss Sedgwick and Mrs. Sigourney.

News from the Churches.

Retreat, Essex county, *Va.* December 24, 1836.

Since the abatement of sickness in my family, I have been laboring to awaken the churches to a sense of duty, and to call the attention of

Digitized by Google

the brethren to personal reformation. Many of the churches are alive to this, and the good consequences of their influence are already seen. Personal holiness alone will secure congregational purity; for a congregation is made up of individuals and partakes of the character of its individuals. In King William county we have a proof of the above; for now that the churches are devoted to the truth, and are regular and zealous in their worship, the work of the Lord begins to prosper in their hands. The proclamation is thus supported and recommended to the world; whereas when the brethren are inattentive, cold, and lifeless, the eloquence of an Apollos is as water spilled upon the ground. Several have been immersed, and many more we hope soon will be. Prejudice in the people is not as strong as formerly; but the opposition of the clergy, I fear, will be for life.

We visited the brethren in Richmond lately, and preached for them several times. The church in Richmond has suffered much from many causes; but there is a redeeming quality among them. The brethren are anxious for peace, harmony, and love. Difficulties have interrupted their harmony and success for a time; but still those difficulties have not obliterated reformation in Richmond, nor removed the necessity for it. A few returned to the Baptist church upon a *renunciation* of "baptism for the remission of sins," &c. And many professors are laughing at the idea of reformation, just as Demas might have laughed at the Corinthian church to hide his own love of the present world; but the church in Corinth was the "church of God:" and I would prefer being in a church where the institutions of Christ were attended to in the midst of much difficulty, to being in the most peaceful corner of Babylon. Peace at the expense of truth is dearly bought, and will be well paid for. There is a very general misapprehension concerning us, both among the teachers and the taught: it seems impossible for us to get the credit of common integrity as to the motives which actuate us in attempting a reformation of ourselves and others: we are rather treated with scurrilous contempt. That our attempt at reformation is imperfect we are ready to acknowledge; but still we contend that the fault is in the perversity of the subject to be reformed, and not in the principles of reformation. What Paul said of the law, we may say of those principles—"For what the law could not do in *that it was weak through the* FLESH," &c. However, we keep the avenues to our minds open, and are willing to learn from any quarter how we shall do better. And here we would seriously inquire whether those who scorn us on account of our imperfect reformation would unite with us provided we presented a more perfect one? There is nevertheless considerable talk in some communities about reformation; but it must be "REAL" and "RADICAL;" there must be no failure!! But I would like to know how a sect can reform which considers it heresy of the worst kind for a change, either in faith or practice, to be proposed. Let any one try it, and he will be immediately suspected of "Campbellism," and he will incur the necessity of speaking and writing against us in order to clear himself of the charge. It is curious to look into the religious world with an eye enlightened by the truth as it is in Jesus; and it is painful as it is curious. While among all the sects any *new stratagem* is hit upon for revival purposes which may be likely to succeed, yet there is the same general opposition to the commandments of Jesus Christ. Few there are in the

Digitized by Google

world willing to labor for the Lord, but many are zealously engaged in defending human inventions. A man may recommend to his own church, with honor, what he has heard has been successful in an opposing community; but let the same individual propose a return to primitive faith and order, and he will be loaded with hard names and reproaches; and as long as the "Man of Sin" reigns it will continue to be so.

JAMES HENSHALL.

LEXINGTON, *Ky.* December 30, 1836.

The church here continues to grow in strength; but few of the weekly meetings pass without an addition to the number of those who worship in the ancient apostolic mode. There is so much beauty and consistency in the scriptures; morality so pure, so elevated; sentiment so sublime, that, when properly understood, their divinity is admitted—all opposition is disarmed; and sinners, repenting sinners, fly to Jesus as a sure refuge from the impending wrath which is treasured up for the ungodly. Much good is to be hoped for from the rising generation. The young mind will receive truths much more readily than the old. Habituated, as the latter generally are, to a particular train of thought, and disciplined in the scholastic theology of the times, and deeply imbued with prejudice, but little good can be expected from them. How much have the sects to answer for! Their conceptions of Christianity are the origin of all Atheism and Deism, particularly of the latter. Until within a few years past I was a Deist: I speak it with shame. I did not believe that God had adopted a plan of salvation designed only for a few of the human race; and that although all men are free agents, and all sinners, yet God, through special and particular visitations of the Holy Spirit, would select a few of these sinners, and leave the greatest number to perish. This doctrine exhibited God as a partial and unjust being. I observed schisms, contradictions, and divisions, a proud and aspiring clergy—the natural fruit of these systems. There was confusion, disorder, derangement. I would naturally contrast it with the order, regularity, and harmony of the visible creation, and a confirmation of Deism would be the result. I lived thus until I became acquainted with the gospel as taught and proclaimed by the Reformers and primitive Christians; its broad philanthropy calling all to drink of the waters of life freely—prohibiting none who believed upon the testimony of the Prophets and Apostles that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and would put themselves under his subjection. This is so plain, so consistent with our ideas of the impartiality and justness of a benevolent Creator, that a mind devoid of prejudice, whether it be sceptical or sectarian, must assent to its truth.

JAMES M. SHAKLEFORD.

CALLAWAY COUNTY, *Missouri*, December 24, 1836.

The multiplied mercies of our heavenly Father are still extended toward us; and we are generally enjoying health, and peace seems to abound amongst us. The public mind in many parts of Missouri begins to be somewhat disabused. And if the teachers of the reformation could be persuaded to let the sects alone and attend to the simplicity of the gospel, there might much good be done. The sects seem to take pleasure in misrepresenting us and throwing every odium on us in their

Digitized by Google

power, but generally dressed in some fictitious garb. Whether you visit a Methodist camp-meeting, a Presbyterian collection, or Baptist association, your ears are stunned with the war-trumpet and the marshalling of the troops, and the exhortations of the recruiting officers, forming one grand crusade (as they call it) against "Campbellism;" while they are raising phantoms, and fighting ghosts and hobgoblins that exist only in their imaginations. And so very zealous was Mr. Green, the Presiding Elder amongst the Methodists, that he undertook to prove that the Holy Spirit operated efficiently without the intervention of second causes, (or without the Word,) and you could only have pitied his ignorance of the scriptures if you had heard him. And so great was his zeal to oppose you, sir, that he attempted to impress the public mind with the belief that you denied infant salvation, and to find ground for this opinion in your Extra on Remission of Sins.

These and the like proceedings arouse the feelings of some of our brethren, and they are not sparing in their remarks on that system which requires such unhallowed means to sustain it. But experience has taught me (and I think it the best teacher) to let them alone; or, as the Saviour said to his disciples respecting the Pharisees, "If the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch." Indeed I am persuaded that to treat with silent contempt many of their representations, is to them the greatest mortification.

We are progressing as usual, still receiving some from the different sects, and some yet have the moral courage to make the good confession; and amongst those who unite themselves with us, we have the consolation to know that the greater part of them are people of standing and intelligence. We number at this time near one hundred, besides what have gone to Millersburg; and I think there are from forty to fifty members in that church. The time I trust is not far distant when churches will spring up in many neighborhoods in Missouri, and "when the wilderness and solitary places will bloom and blossom as the rose."

ABSALOM RICE.

Queries.

If a church of Jesus Christ uses all the remedies that God has ordained for restoring an offending brother or sister, and cannot effect it, but are compelled to cut them off; can they, according to the word of God, ever be restored to the church afterwards?

D. P. HENDERSON.

ANSWER.—It was the *Novatians* who, in the third century, first adopted the notion that those who sinned after baptism and were separated from the church, could never be restored. They seem to have been led to this view from what Paul says in Hebrews vi.—"It is impossible to renew again by reformation those who were once enlightened," &c. and because they supposed baptism to be the only means by which the church could bestow the remission of sins, and this could be administered but once for this purpose. Accordingly those whom they

Digitized by Google

cut off were never afterwards restored. On this account they received the name of *Cathari* or Puritans.

This doctrine, however, has no place in the scriptures. On the contrary, those who are "spiritual" are expressly commanded to "restore" such as are "overtaken in a fault." Galatians vii. 1. and James says, "Brethren, if any *among you* be seduced from the truth, and any one *turn him back*, let him know that he who converts *a sinner* from the error of his way, shall *save a soul from death*," &c. Indeed the express object of the excision of any one is, as Paul declares, 1 Cor. v., "that the spirit may be *saved;*" and, when a penitent has given sufficient evidence of reformation, there can be no reason why 'such a one' should not be restored (as directed 2 Cor. chap. ii.) to the affection and privileges of the church. Paul delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, not that they might be destroyed, as some absurdly imagine to be the object of discipline, but that they might "learn not to defame" through the "chastisement" inflicted upon them by the malignant being into whose power they were delivered. Doubtless there are many who will not learn even in this school, and there is a certain point beyond which the recovery of a sinner is not to be expected. Such persons of course cannot be restored to the church; but it is simply because they have entirely fallen away, and "it is impossible to renew them by *reformation.*"

Should those who are under the original gospel, and profess to believe and obey it, and are advocates for the freedom of the infant mind from the influence of sectarianism, send their little ones to Sunday schools, instead of teaching their children the Bible themselves?

W. D. JOURDAN.

ANSWER.—A portion of the Lord's day cannot be more profitably occupied than in teaching children to read or commit to memory the sacred scriptures, and inculcating upon them the important principles of Christianity. Schools for this purpose should be carefully encouraged by all Christians. But if in Sunday schools the Bible is superseded or perverted by human opinions and theories, whether in the abstract or the concrete, and they are thus converted into nurseries of sectarianism, no day would be holy enough to sanctify them. Upon this subject, however, I beg leave to subjoin the following remarks by that esteemed writer THOMAS DICK of Scotland:—

"When we substitute *in the room of the scriptures*, catechisms or any other abstract compends of divinity, however orthodox, we virtually declare that the wisdom of man is superior to the wisdom of God, and that the plans devised by erring mortals are to be set in competition with the plan of *inspired men*, who derived their instructions immediately from the Divine Spirit. Besides, the instructions on religion derived from such compilations, even when understood, (which they seldom are,) are received by the young merely on the authority of the

Digitized by Google

authors or compilers, and can never produce such a thorough and rational conviction of their truth and obligation, as if they were delivered in the language of men who derived their instructions and commission immediately from Heaven. In deviating from the plan of Divine Revelation, numerous disputes and dissensions have arisen in Christian society. Almost all the controversies and dissensions which have taken place as to the manner of conducting Sabbath schools have arisen from such a circumstance as this. Shall the words of a certain *catechism*, whether understood or not, be crammed into the memories of all the pupils? With one party it is of little consequence, although the same leading *truths* be communicated in scriptural or other language, unless the precise vocables of the formulary they approve of be strictly adhered to and committed to memory, as if they were the immediate dictates of inspiration. Hence a sectarian spirit has been engendered, contentions and wranglings have been introduced, the advantages which might have been derived from *the study of the pure Oracles of Heaven* prevented, and the religious improvement of the young sacrificed to party rancor and hostility."—*Mental Illumination*, page 313.

From whence did the Priests and Levites get the idea that the Messiah would come baptizing, as implied in their query, John i. 25.?

JOHN UDELL, Jr.

ANS.—It does not appear that their query proceeded from this expectation, or that the Jews were acquainted with any such institution as baptism, until it was introduced by John. The baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, is a highly figurative allusion of the Apostle Paul in Hebs. The washings and immersions under the law were not analogous to baptism—for in these the unclean person dipped or washed himself. And as to proselyte baptism, it is a practice of which we have no account in the scriptures, and which cannot be traced up to the time of Christ. The Priests and Levites knew that unto the Messiah would be "the gathering of the people;" and when they saw John baptizing and making disciples, they very naturally inquired, 'Why do you baptize, if you are not the Messiah, or a Prophet possessed of plenary authority?' In other words, 'Why do you make disciples, if you are not duly empowered to be a leader of Israel?' R. R.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISCUSSION.

AN interesting discussion of Roman Catholicism has just terminated in the city of Cincinnati. The following rules, previously agreed upon, I find published in the Cross and Baptist Journal, of January 13.

RULES OF A DISCUSSION

To be held by Bishop Purcell *and* Mr. Alexander Campbell *on Mr. C's propositions in the Gazette.*

I. WE agree that the copy-right of the Discussion shall be sold to some bookseller, who shall have it taken down by a stenographer, and that all the avails of the copy-right shall

Digitized by Google

be equally divided between such two public charities as Bishop P. and Mr. C. shall respectively designate.

II. That the discussion shall take place in the Sycamore street Meeting-house, and it shall continue seven days, exclusive of Sunday, commencing this morning, from half past 9 o'clock A. M. to half past 12, and from 3 to 5 P. M. each day.

III. Mr. Campbell shall open the discussion each session, and Bishop Purcell respond. During the morning session the first speech of each shall not exceed one hour, nor the second half an hour. In the afternoon each speaker shall occupy only half an hour.

IV. The discussion shall be under the direction of a Board of five Moderators; of whom each party shall choose two, and these a fifth; any three of whom shall constitute a *quorum*.

V. The duties of the Moderators shall be to preserve order in the assembly and to keep the parties to the question.

Cross & Baptist Journal.

An account of the particular circumstances attending this discussion has not been received in time for the February number. It will appear in that of March.

R.

POETRY.

From the German of Haller.

ETERNITY.

Ye forests, wastes of melancholy pines,
Dark as the darkness of the tomb,—
Through whose cold depths no straggling sun-beam shines;
Ye hollow rocks, within whose womb
The screams of many an evil-omen'd bird,
Mix'd with the sound of beating wings is heard!
And ye dull streams, whose waters idly feed
Sands desolate, and blasted mead:—
Scenes of damp horror o'er my spirits breathe
The stern solemnity of death!
Cloud with your presence my dark song, and be
Terrific emblems of ETERNITY.
My friend is dead! The dizzy eye can trace
A form like his that in the gloom appears.
I start—his voice is in my ears!—
In vain—he cannot leave his prison-place;
He cannot burst eternity's embrace!
No image of the future scared his rest,
He view'd life's shifting scenes with eager eye;
But the last act is come! the curtains fall—
The disappearing lights—his heart appal;
And all that was so like reality
Is now a hollow jest!
The world of spirits, desolate and drear,
Surrounds him with its chilling atmosphere;
Trembling we whisper, Does he still retain
The feelings that employ the spirit here,
Still sympathise with earthly joy and pain?——

Digitized by Google

And what am I? I am what he hath been,
And will be what he is—alas! how soon!
Even now I mourn youth's morning hours serene,
The sun of life already is at noon,
And, ere the evening comes with yellow light,
May sink in sudden night—
The dim eye may forever close,
No dreams of hope to bless that last repose!
ETERNITY, thou dark mysterious sea—
All that is past, and all that is to be,
Ages and worlds are present still to thee!
To thee the embers of the days gone by
Are seeds and blossoms of futurity!
Oh! who shall measure thy sublime expanse!
The date of worlds to thee is as the glance
Or momentary twinkle of the eye:
How many suns have faded in yon sky!
How many yet remain!
What is to thee their measur'd reign?
Their weights, like those with which man measures time,
Fall, when the appointed period for their doom
Arrives,—they hold awhile their course sublime—
One sinks—a second shines—his fires consume—
Another pours o'er heaven his cheerful flame:
They fade; but thou art still the same!—
The stars, whose silent majesty
Delights the earthly gazer's eye,
To thee seem withering away
Like grass in summer's sultry day,
Lovely and transient as the rose
That in the dewy morning glows,
And perishes ere ev'ning's close!
Long ere existence from the void awoke,
Ere from the abyss the world emerging broke,
Ere gush'd the first rich stream of light
From Chaos' dreary night—
Even then wert thou, mysterious power,
Remote as ever from thy first waking hour;
And when on earth shall close its second night,
When nought remains but silent desert space;
When other heavens, with other glories bright,
Shall sink, and suns and systems end their race,
Still young as now shalt thou rejoicing gaze
Along the unbounded line of future days!———
The wings of thought, though swifter than the flight
Of time, or sound, or air, or light,
When to explore thy boundless realm address'd,
Flutter with weariness, and sink for rest.
In vain I strive to grasp the thought sublime,
Heap fancied worlds on worlds, and time on time!
Back from the fearful height the straining sight
Giddily gazes on unending space,
Nor yet hath found one resting-place;
Forward in vain it ventures to explore—
ETERNITY unbroken lies before!

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER III.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *March*, 1837.

THE POWER OF FALSEHOOD.

AMONG the various causes which retard the dissemination of true knowledge, that peculiar state of mind induced by a long continuance in error, is not the least.

Such is the organization of man, and the impetuous force of the passions and propensities with which he is endowed, that it is difficult at any time to turn the current of his thoughts from its deep-worn bed, or rectify its devious windings. But the mere influence of habit, or the striking unwillingness which prevails in men to abandon cherished views and principles, are by no means so great obstacles to reformation, as the peculiar influence of error and delusion itself, by which the love of the marvellous; the animal feelings, or the emotions of pride have been encouraged; while those powers, by whose accurate discrimination alone, truth is to be discovered, have remained inactive, or become enfeebled.

He whose mind has long borne the shackles of error, has become incapable of enjoying, or properly appreciating truth; as the long-incarcerated prisoner has scarce a wish for liberty, and, even if emancipated, moves as though he were still restrained by his fetters. Just sentiments, and sober realities but overwhelm and confuse the errorist, as the light of day only serves to blind the eye which has been accustomed to darkness. So perverted, indeed, and besotted, does he often become, under the intoxica-

Digitized by Google

ting influence of delusion, that he is wholly incapable of even distinguishing truth when it is presented, and is insensible to every stimulus but that of fiction.

Hence it is, that to some men the greatest absurdities appear the most logical conclusions; and the veriest fables the most evident truths. And hence it is that persons will come, by frequent repetition, to believe the very lie which they themselves invented. There are indeed no extravagancies too great, and no wonders too incredible for the mind which has become inebriated by the spirit of delusion, or stupefied by the narcotic influences of habitual error. When Caligula made his horse a Roman Consul, it may have appeared quite a rational procedure to a people accustomed to the greatest enormities, and imbued with the deepest superstition. The wretched idolator burns part of a piece of wood to cook his meal, and of the remainder forms a carved image—"A deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? He falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my God." While he is engaged in such orisons, we need seek no other illustration of the power of falsehood.

It is by this peculiar perverting influence which falsehood exerts upon the human mind, that Satan, who is the father of lies, succeeds in completing his victory over the unwary. His strength is in 'the power and signs and wonders of falsehood; and in the deceit of unrighteousness among the destroyed; because they did not embrace the love of the truth, that they might be saved.' By this, he leads the timid female to burn herself with the body of her deceased husband; and, by this, persuades the unhappy votary of Shivu to swing himself in the air upon hooks fastened in the living flesh.

To the same influence, doubtless, are to be attributed the innumerable inconsistencies and absurdities in faith and conduct which obtain in Christendom; whether it be the penances and mortifications, the belief in false miracles, purgatory, and transubstantiation of the Catholics; or the strange perversity of the Protestants in supposing that the various discordant systems which they have themselves invented, and which they seek to

Digitized by Google

perpetuate, are identical with primitive Christianity. Upon this principle alone can be explained their singular indifference to the plainest precepts of the Divine Record; and the blindness which hinders them from seeing the tendency of the concessions they are compelled to make with respect to matters, which at the same time, they are as far from believing, as from practising.

There is not perhaps a single cardinal principle or fact in Christianity, which is not professedly received by the different religious parties; yet each, admitting the original unity of the church and the binding obligation of the injunctions to brotherly love, remains alienated, disunited, and opposed. And while they grant that the scriptures are "the only rule of faith and practice," they yield an implicit credence to human opinions, and a ready obedience to the traditions of men. A Stuart will declare that "*bapto* and *baptizo* mean to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge* into any thing liquid," and that "all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this," yet continue the Presbyterian practice of *sprinkling*. A Wall will remain Episcopal while he uses the following language:—"The general and ordinary way of baptizing in ancient times, was by immersion. This is so plain and clear, from an infinite number of passages, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; and wonder that any individuals are to be found, who can treat with ridicule or contempt the Baptists, merely for their use of dipping, and more especially as it was in all probability the way in which our blessed Saviour, and most certainly the usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." And a Gieseler will adhere to his professorship of Theology at Gottingen, and together with the whole religious community, who commend his sentiments, will pertinaciously sustain the honors of the clergy and the unscriptural systems of the day, while in his "Text-Book of Ecclesiastical History," lately published, he thus speaks of the internal relations of the Christian church in the apostolic age:—"The churches every where formed themselves on the model of the mother church at Jerusalem. At the head of each were the elders, all officially of equal rank, though in several instances a peculiar authority seems to have been conceded to some one

Digitized by Google

individual from personal considerations. Under the superintendence of the elders were the deacons and deaconesses. Rom. xvi. 1.; 1 Tim. v. 9, 10. All these received their support, like the poor, from the free contributions of the church. 1 Tim. v. 17.; 1 Cor. ix. 13.——The Apostle wishes that elders may be apt to teach. 1 Timothy iii. 2.; 2 Timothy ii. 24. The power of speaking, and exhortation was considered the gift of the Spirit, and was possessed by many of the Christians, though exercised in various ways—(*prophets—teachers—speaking with tongues.* 1 Cor. xii. 28—31.; ch. xvi.) There was as yet no distinct order of clergy, for the whole society of Christians was 'a royal priesthood,' (1 Pet. ii. 9.)—'the chosen people of God.' 1 Pet. v. 3. Compare Deut. iv. 20.; ix. 29. They assembled for worship in private houses; in cities the churches were often divided into several societies, each having its particular place of meeting."

To what cause then can we attribute these and the thousand other inconsistencies of the religious community, except to the bewildering effect of the speculations and errors into which they have been so long indoctrinated? It is the influence of false teaching which has so confused the religious world; depraved their taste; or fostered selfish principles, that they have little relish for the simplicity of truth, and even when they stumble upon primitive Christianity are unable to perceive it.

R. R.

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 60.]

THE PRAYER-MEETING.

"AND pray who is the Pope?" said my companion.

What! I returned, are you the Genius of History, and yet unacquainted with the Roman Pontiffs who have so long occupied the chair of St. Peter?

"I assure you," rejoined he, "that I have kept a faithful record, yet though we have arrived at the year 4047 since the creation, there is no such name entered upon my tablets. As to Peter the

Digitized by Google

Apostle of whom I spoke, he is now living, and has never been styled either Saint or Pope."

Is it possible, cried I, that I have been brought to the apostolic age! And this too after so many have tried in vain to get beyond the time of the Westminster Assembly, or the period of the Reformation, and so few have succeeded in attaining a greater antiquity than the age of the Fathers!

"This was because they refused any longer to accept my guidance, and preferred the services of Fiction. To gratify your better wishes I have met you at a better age, and amidst these hallowed scenes to which Fancy has transported you."

What figures then, said I, are those which I perceive in this garden of Olivet who are prostrate upon the ground or kneeling in the attitude of prayer? There are many also moving silently amongst those beautiful palm trees upon the sides of the mountain.

"These are the disciples of Jesus. They love to frequent those sacred haunts where their Master so often resorted. This too is a period of affliction; and it is here, where Jesus experienced so many sufferings, that they seek in the night-watches strength and consolation. But it is time for us to enter the city."

Turning slightly towards the right, we soon entered upon a beautiful road leading across the valley towards the eastern portico of the Temple, and which was formed of arch upon arch, to prevent the priest, as my guide informed me, from being polluted by any secret grave, when he went to burn the red heifer upon the Mount of Olives.* Having reached the opposite side, we inclined a little to the north, and ascending the hill before us soon reached one of the massy portals of the eastern wall.

"This," observed my guide, "is the Sheep-gate,† so called because the sheep destined for sacrifice are driven through it to the Temple. And now that we have entered the city, you may perceive near to us the sheep-market;‡ and upon your left, close by the Temple, the deep pool of Bethesda,§ or 'the house of mercy,' with its five porches, noted for the miraculous cure of the impo-

* Brown's Antiquities, vol. 1, page 59; Numb. xix.
† Nehem. iii. 1. Now called St. Stephen's gate. ‡ John v. 2.
§ Id. ib. "A pool (or place for swimming in, *kolumbethra*, i. e. deep enough in some places for swimming in." *Taylor.* Calmet, p. 170. "This is still to be seen near St. Ste-

Digitized by Google

tent man, and in whose waters the sheep selected as victims are washed.* Looking down the street towards the west, you see at the north-western angle of the Temple the tower Antonia, and directly opposite upon the north, and at no great distance, you notice a large and elegant edifice."

I have remarked it, said I. It is brilliantly lighted up as though for a splendid banquet, and I almost fancy that I hear, occasionally, even at this distance, the noise of the revellers.

"This is the palace† of King Herod who is now at Jerusalem, and who in order to please the Jews, has lately beheaded John the brother of James, and cast Peter into prison.‡ It was to this palace that Jesus was sent by Pilate, and presented to Herod, by whose order he was mocked with the robes of royalty."§

Continuing to advance towards the west, we descended gradually into the lower part of the city, and, turning to the left, entered a narrower street. Here the houses which were in general one story high,‖ were more compactly built, and almost every one was furnished with a gateway¶ or porch in front, in which were placed benches. As I followed the rapid steps of my guide, I suddenly distinguished the sound of music and voices, and discovered at a distance a gaily apparelled throng of both sexes, advancing with songs, dancing and merriment.** In the front of the procession was a person bearing a cup of wine;†† then four attendants supporting upon poles a splendidly ornamented purple canopy,‡‡ beneath which walked a female dressed in the richest manner and deeply veiled. Upon her head she wore a cap set with pearls in various forms, from beneath which her braided tresses descended upon her shoulders. By her side was a noble-looking youth in a white robe with blue tufts or fringes,§§ and wearing a beautiful crown.‖‖ One of the male attendants threw, from time to time, small pieces of money among the crowd; while others occasionally strewed handfuls of barley before the youthful pair.¶¶

phen's gate, and it bounded the Temple on the north. It is a reservoir one hundred and fifty feet long, and forty wide." Chateaubriand, p. 353.

* Calmet, page 169. † Chateaubriand, page 343. ‡ Acts xii. § Luke xxiii. 11. ‖ Calmet, p. 479. ¶ Shaw's Travels. ** Calmet, p. 628; Ps xlv. 15. †† Brown's Antiquities, vol. 2, p. 145. ‡‡ Id. p. 144; "His banner over me was love." Cant. ii. 4. §§ "To distinguish the Israelites from other people the Lord commanded them to wear tufts or fringes, at the four corners of their upper garments, of a blue colour—Numb. xv. 38; Deut. xxii. 12. From Matth. ix. 20, we see that our Saviour wore those fringes. *Calmet*, p. 350. ‖‖ Cant. iii. 11. ¶¶ Lightf., Heb and Talm. Exer. on John ii. 1.

Digitized by Google

This, I presume, said I, is the Jewish marriage procession, of which I have so often heard.

"You have guessed truly," replied my companion: "We must give place to it.* As it passes, you may notice that ten of the maidens who accompany it bear in their hands staves with a cup attached at the top. In this they carry oil in which a wick is placed to form a lamp, which they replenish occasionally as the flame grows dim. These are the companions of the bride, who having met the bridegroom are returning to the marriage entertainment."†

This gay pageant soon passed into a neighboring street and was hid from view. I stood, however, listening to the sound of their rejoicings as it died away in the distance, until my conductor bade me follow him. Passing into the gateway of the house before which we stood, we entered a passage, and ascended a staircase, when we found ourselves upon a terraced roof, which, I discovered, was, like those of all the other houses, perfectly flat,‡ and defended upon each side by a low wall or parapet. We had accordingly no difficulty in passing over several of these roofs, when my guide suddenly drew me towards the wall which overlooked the inner court of the building upon which we were. This court was an oblong area, enclosed on all sides by apartments protected by cloisters or piazzas, and was now lighted up, and filled with a numerous assemblage.§ But how different was the scene from that which I had just witnessed! Here a large company, plainly habited, were engaged in solemn devotion. A subject of the greatest moment seemed to engage their attention. Many of them were in tears, and I could not but remark the absorbing interest with which they hung upon the fervent petitions which the speaker uttered in a loud voice, as they knelt upon the mats with which the court was strewed, and raised their hands towards heaven.‖ One emotion seemed to pervade every bosom, and one united response arose as their requests were uttered.¶ The venerable appearance of the aged men and

* Brown's Antiquities, vol. ii. page 145. † Matth. xxv.; Calmet, p. 628. ‡ Shaw's Travels; Mark ii., Luke v. § "When much people are to be admitted, as upon the the celebration of a marriage, the circumcising of a child, or occasions of a like nature, the company is rarely or never received into one of the chambers. The court is the usual place of their reception, which is strewed with mats or carpets for their more commodious entertainment." Shaw's Travels. Luke v. 19; Acts xii. 12. ‖ 1 Kings viii. 54; Acts xx. 36; Eph. iii. 14. 1 Tim. ii. 8. ¶ It was the practice of the Christians to say the Amen

Digitized by Google

matrons; the firm but reverential bearing of the younger; their solemn attitudes; and the expression of mild benignity, blended with submissive sorrow and the confidence of hope, which dwelt upon their countenances, inspired me with awe and reverence. The men, who, after the Jewish custom, wore their beards, were enveloped in plain mantles or cloaks of a brown or white color.* The dress of the females consisted of drawers; a long blue tunic or gown of linen; a girdle or zone round the waist, and a scarf or veil upon the head, which, with a profusion of long dark hair, almost entirely concealed their faces.†

"This," whispered my companion, "is a prayer-meeting of Christians, and that elderly matron upon whose features the light of the lamp so distinctly falls, at the upper end of the court, is Mary the mother of Mark, and the mistress of the mansion."‡

That middle-aged person, then, near her, and upon whom her eye is so often fixed in silence, is doubtless her son; and the anxiety which blends itself with the benign expression of her countenance, is owing to those maternal feelings, which have been alarmed by the martyrdom of James, and which are soothed by the consolations of religion, but not extinguished. Blessed and beloved company! more honored in the lowly mansion, than Herod in his spacious halls; and happier in affliction, than the bridegroom in his joy! It is yours to be troubled, but not distressed; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed! It is yours to rejoice in sorrow—but your sorrow shall be turned into joy!

But who, said I to my companion, is that small man of an erect military port, whose flashing dark eye is so strongly indicative of zeal and intelligence, and who is now opening his lips in prayer?

A loud knocking at the outer gate, which suddenly startled the assembly, prevented me from hearing distinctly the reply. I thought, however, I could distinguish the name of Saul;§ when my guide, beckoning me to the front of the building, pointed out to me a person of a strong athletic make, wrapped in a cloak,

---

aloud at the close of a prayer or thanksgiving, as appears evident from 1 Cor. xiv. 16.
* Brown's Antiquities, vol. 2, page 177. † Id. page 181. ‡ Acts xii. 12. § "Paul" signifies *little*. It is supposed by the learned that Saul was, at the martyrdom of Stephen, enrolled among the Jewish auxiliaries, and in possession of a military command. This, together with the facilities of becoming acquainted with military affairs, afforded by his

Digitized by Google

with a girdle round his loins, and sandals upon his feet, who stood before the door.*

"This," said he, "is Peter, for whom they have been praying, and who has just been liberated from prison by an angel. The damsel Rose has just heard his voice, and is so transported with joy, and the love of telling news so strange and agreeable, that instead of opening the gate, she has returned and informed the company, who scarcely credit her report.†

The gate, however, now opened, and the company coming forth, were filled with astonishment when they saw Peter, whom they were about to overwhelm with questions. "But he made a sign to them with his hand to be silent, and related to them how the Lord had conducted him out of prison. And he said: Inform James and the brethren of these things;"‡ and immediately departing was soon lost to view, while the disciples in an ecstacy of joy glorified the Lord.

And whither has he now gone? I inquired.

"Peter," replied my conductor, "has a wife.§——

Oh! I understand you, said I, he hastens like an affectionate husband to relieve his family from their uneasiness on his account. This is well: and it would have been far more honorable in his pretended successors the Popes, if they had thus fulfilled the sacred duties of husbands and fathers, rather than occupied themselves in the production of those *bulls*, which have occasioned the desolation of whole provinces—which have made many a wife, a widow; and children, orphans.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

DEBATE ON ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

From various published accounts of the recent debate at Cincinnati, the following summary is derived.

Bishop Purcell having consented to enter into a public discussion with Mr. Campbell, the rules already published were adopted, and sundry preliminaries arranged; among which it was agreed upon, in

profession of tent-making, is supposed to account for his frequent use of military figures and phrases. At the time of Peter's arrest, he was at Jerusalem on a mission from the church at Antioch. Compare Acts xi. 30. and xii. 25. * Acts xii, 8, 14. † Id. ib. ‡ Id. ib. § Mark i. 30.

Digitized by Google

order to dispose of the matters at issue within the seven days allotted to the discussion, that Mr. Campbell's eight propositions should be engrossed in the following seven:—

1. The Roman Catholic Institution, sometimes called the 'Holy Apostolic Church, is not now, nor was she ever, catholic, apostolic, or holy; but is a *sect* in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing; not the 'Mother and Mistress of all churches,' but an apostacy from the only true, apostolic and catholic church of Christ.

2. Her notion of apostolic succession is without any foundation in the Bible, in reason, or in fact; an imposition of the most injurious consequences, built upon unscriptural and anti-scriptural traditions, resting wholly upon the opinions of interested and fallible men.

3. She is not uniform in her faith, or united in her members; but mutable and fallible, as any other sect of philosophy or religion,—Jewish, Turkish, or Christian—a confederation of sects under a politico ecclesiastic head.

4. She is the Babylon of John, the Man of Sin of Paul, and the Empire of the Youngest Horn of Daniel's Sea Monster.

5. Her notions of purgatory, indulgences, auricular confession, remission of sins, transubstantiation, supererogation, &c. essential elements of her system, are immoral in their tendency, and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political.

6. Notwithstanding her pretensions to have given us the Bible, and faith in it, we are perfectly independent of her for our knowledge of that book, and its evidences of a divine original.

7. The Roman Catholic religion, if infallible and insusceptible of reformation, as alleged, is essentially anti-American, being opposed to the genius of all free institutions, and positively subversive of them, opposing the general reading of the Scriptures, and the diffusion of useful knowledge among the whole community, so essential to liberty and the permanency of good government.

The Moderators appointed were John C. Rodgers, Mr. Hite, William Disney, Samuel Lewis, and Jacob W. Piatt. On Friday, January 13th, the debate commenced, and was conducted with the utmost order, harmony, and good feeling. A constantly increasing interest was manifested by the citizens until its close.

Of the merits of this discussion, the ability manifested, and the various points sustained, it is unnecessary now to speak, as the whole report will be immediately before the community, who will be enabled to judge for themselves upon which side truth and argument are to be found.

Of the impression made upon those who heard the debate, we have received the most favorable accounts. It seems that the editor of the Cincinnati Gazette, who labored from the first announcement of the matter to forestall public opinion in favor of the Catholics, ventured to prejudge the influence of the discussion, and imbue the public mind with his own prejudices. In order to effect this, he so greatly misrepresented the discussion itself, and the sentiments of the citizens respecting it, that the latter were constrained to call a public meeting in reference thereto, the following report of which is copied from the Cross and Baptist Journal:—

Digitized by Google

"ROMAN CATHOLIC DISCUSSION.

"At a meeting of a large number of gentlemen, who attended the recent debate between Mr. Campbell and Bishop Purcell, held at the Sycamore street Baptist church, on Tuesday evening, January 24, for the purpose of expressing themselves with regard to the merits of the debate, Gen. Reese E. Price was called to the chair, and W. T. Truman was appointed Secretary. On motion, it was

"*Resolved*, That Samuel Lewis, Esq.; Major Daniel Gano, Daniel Corwin, Rev. W. H. Raper, and Rev. Heman Norton, be appointed a committee to report resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting.

"Whereupon the committee retired, and reported the following, which were adopted unanimously:—

"Whereas, in consequence of an attack made on the distinguishing principles of the Protestant religion, by Bishop Purcell, of this city, (opposing the general use and study of the Bible,) during the last session of the College of Teachers, both in reference to Doctor Wilson's lecture, and that of A. Campbell, of Virginia, (in affirming that the Protestant Reformation had been the cause of all the contention and infidelity in the world)—And whereas the latter gentleman, in a discourse delivered in defence of Protestant principles, in the Wesley chapel, in October last, offered certain propositions, which led to a request from many of the citizens of Cincinnati for a full discussion of these principles, to which Mr. Campbell subsequently acquiesced, and has now met Bishop Purcell in a full discussion of them; and inasmuch as efforts have been made, on the part of some of the political papers of this city, to prepossess and forestall public opinion on the real merits and issues of that discussion we feel that it is due to truth, to religion, to ourselves, and to the community at large, to state and subscribe the following resolutions:—

"1. *Resolved*, That it is the unanimous opinion of this meeting that the cause of Protestantism has been fully sustained throughout this discussion.

"2. *Resolved*, That in our opinion the arguments in favor of Protestantism, and the objections to the errors of Popery have not been met.

"3. *Resolved*, That we look forward to the publication of this discussion, as a powerful antidote to the sophistry and arrogance of all the advocates of Romanism; and that we have the fullest confidence in submitting it to the impartial decision of the American people.

"4. *Resolved*, That we approve of the spirit and temper, and were pleased with the power of arguments and authorities by which Mr. Campbell sustained his positions, and concur with him in possessing "no unkind feelings or prejudices towards individuals, but believe the principles of Romanism inconsistent with our free institutions."

"5. *Resolved*, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in all the city papers, and that Editors in other places who may have noticed the discussion, be requested to publish them. REES E. PRICE, *Chairman.*

"W. T. TRUMAN, *Secretary.*"

[The above was signed by upwards of eighty, of the most respectable names of the city. —*Ed. Cross & Jour.*]

As an explanation of the course of Mr. Hammond upon this occasion, the editor of the Journal and Luminary, after quoting a number of paragraphs from the Gazette, in which the strong prejudices and *penchants* of its editor are fully displayed, proceeds to observe:—

"Of the spirit and feelings of the editor of the Gazette towards Catholics and Protestants, and towards Mr. Campbell, our readers cannot fail to form a pretty accurate estimate, from the few extracts which we have given. As a political writer, especially in the arena of party, Mr. Hammond occupies a station somewhat conspicuous. But when it comes to questions of morals, or religion, we cannot regard his example, or precepts, as safe guides, either in relation to this life, or that to come.

Digitized by Google

"Our estimate of *public opinion* is necessarily taken from those with whom we associate. Hence, in the same community, different men come to different conclusions of what that opinion is. In every contest in regard to evangelical religion, we may always expect that certain classes of men will be found to favor that side which gives the freest scope to licentiousness—which imposes the least restraint on human conduct, and opens the widest door of escape from divine punishment. Doctrines which humble the pride of the human heart, and lay the corruptions of men under the strong interdicts of the moral law, cannot be expected to find favor with those who would cast off all responsibility to a Lawgiver whose character is holiness; or from those who would live here unrestrained, and escape hereafter the penalty of transgression. It has ever been so, and ever must be.

"If we were to go through this city, and gather together infidels of every name, and all who have determined to live irrespective of accountability hereafter, we should probably find them giving an undivided support to the opinions which the editor of the Gazette has now, and frequently heretofore advanced in reference to Catholics and Protestants. And this may well be expected. The Catholic religion accommodates itself to the corruptions of men, and by confessions and penances, and absolutions, and a temporary purgatory, offers escape from the eternal punishment which the law of God denounces. Hence the *willingness* of men to believe what, to an unbiassed judgment, would seem the greatest of absurdities.

"Of public opinion in the city, upon this discussion, we have formed a different opinion. The number is not small of whom we have made inquiry, and leaving out the classes of men above indicated, we have been led to believe that opinion to be widely different from what Mr. Hammond so confidently asserts."

One of the palpable misrepresentations of the Gazette, to wit, that this discussion was a "war upon the Catholics," is well exposed by the Cross and Baptist Journal of Cincinnati. After quoting largely from the Report of the Proceedings of the College of Teachers, to show the origin of the discussion, the editor observes:—

"The reader will see that no attack was made on Catholics during the session of the College of Teachers, unless a straight-forward course on the fundamental principles of Protestants should be called an attack. On the other hand, the fundamental principles of Protestants were directly assailed by Messrs. Purcell and Montgomery. They were defended; hence the late discussion. Yet in the face of this, this discussion has been called a "*war upon the Catholics.*" The following paragraph appeared in the Cincinnati Gazette on the day previous to the commencement of the discussion, January 12th:—

'*The war on the Catholics*.—We understand that Alexander Campbell is in the city, prepared to demolish, not the Cathedral and Chapel, which the Catholics have erected in our city, but the whole fabric of '*Catholic superstition.*' Rebecca Reed has had her day—Maria Monk is rather on the wane—Mr. Campbell comes in at the death, as Hector put the finish to the life of Patrocles.'

"Now, we feel authorized to pronounce the assertion implied in the foregoing paragraph, that the late discussion was a *war on the Catholics*, an OUTRAGE UPON TRUTH. And the notices of the discussion which have since appeared in the Gazette, have been almost uniformly of this character; for proof of which last position we refer to the forthcoming report of the recent discussion."

That the editor of the Journal and Luminary has explained the secret of Mr. Hammond's hostility to religious reformation, and of his love for the *ancien regime*, will be evident to all. And that Mr. Hammond was wholly unfitted from being a judge in the case is very manifest from the party rancor and hostility which he evinced before the commencement of the discussion, and the false and unfounded imputations in which he indulged. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him." R. R.

Digitized by Google

NOTE.—Since the foregoing was written, the Daily Cincinnati Gazette of January 30th has been received and it is but justice to Mr. Hammond to state that he appears to be much softened in his tone, and that his partial and premature statements of public sentiment, and reckless assertions that "Catholicism had gained by the debate;" that it was a "grand failure," &c. &c. have now dwindled down into the mere *private opinion* of the editor.

The same paper contains the following interesting letter from Asa Shinn, of whom Mr. Hammond thus speaks:—

"Mr. Shinn is a man advanced in years—a clergyman of long standing in the Methodist Church, and of the most respectable standing. He is now associated with the Reformed Methodists, and located in Cincinnati."

It will be perceived that the talented writer of this letter thought the addresses of Bishop Purcell "calculated to make a good impression both upon Protestants and upon Catholics," and rejoices in the hope, "that the Roman Catholic religion is not so infallible as to be incapable of improvement in the sunshine of American liberty." That it is a part of the Roman Catholic religion to accommodate itself to circumstances and the necessity of the case, is matter of history. And that by making such accommodation, Bishop Purcell might make a good impression, is not to be doubted. It is to be remembered, however, that the same elasticity which will admit compression, will allow an equal degree of expansion when the pressure is taken off: and that it is a proof of the imperfection or corruption of a religious system when it becomes tolerable only by being amended and improved.

R.

From the Daily Cincinnati Gazette.

THE GRAND DEBATE.

As my opinion of the late discussion of the respective merits of Protestantism and Catholicism has been solicited by friends whose wishes I ought to respect, the following brief statement is submitted, with the hope that it will give no just cause of offence to any man or to any party.

Having attended throughout the discussion, with as much regularity as I conveniently could, I retired at the close, with increased confidence in the character both of Mr. Campbell and Bishop Purcell; being convinced that if the debate should be faithfully published, it would, in several ways, have a good influence upon society.

Mr. Campbell, I think, sustained the cause of Protestantism with candor, and with great ability; his documentary proofs were abundant and decisive, and his arguments were incontrovertible; and it is difficult to conceive how any impartial mind can hesitate to admit, that he deserves to be respected by Protestant Christians of all denominations, for this magnanimous effort to diffuse light upon a subject which we believe essential to the best interests of all mankind.

The Bishop also exhibited a degree of mildness and liberality of sentiment, that was not anticipated. His addresses, taken altogether, were calculated to make a good impression, both upon Protestants and upon Catholics: from the former they would remove prejudice, and incline to exercise more charity towards our Roman Catholic brethren; and on the latter, they tended to make the impression, that the spirit of persecution ought not to be indulged, and that the practice of it ought never to be adopted in these United States of America.

The Bishop has defended his cause with considerable ingenuity, and sometimes with striking displays of eloquence. We were pleased to notice his efforts to modify the Papal system, and to abandon the dark foundation of his predecessors; and we rejoice in the hope, that the Roman Catholic religion is not so infallible as to be incapable of improvement in the sunshine of American liberty.

Such of Mr. Campbell's positions as could be encountered with apparent plausibility, were promptly met by the Bishop; others, more formidable, were passed by in silence. The ingenuity of this learned advocate of clerical power, in removing the impression made by the arguments of his antagonist, was sometimes very striking; insomuch, that some Protestants who were in attendance, were probably not without their fears that their cause would suffer loss by the controversy. Mr. Campbell, however, returned to the charge with a composed dignity, and with a freedom from all signs of intimidation, which evinced to all spectators that he had no misgivings of mind, and that he knew well the solidity of the ground on which he had taken his stand.

Digitized by Google

There was no point at which the Bishop appeared to falter more, than in his weak attempt to set aside Mr. Campbell's arguments, founded upon the prophecies of Daniel, the Apocalypse, and the Apostle Paul. Here, it is presumed, intelligent Catholics began to tremble for their champion. Mr. Campbell constantly saw his advantage, and improved it with a promptness and skill not often equalled, and perhaps never surpassed.

If the whole of this debate be faithfully published, I cannot help thinking it will furnish a mental feast to the intelligent public, and that it will have a tendency no less to promote charity, than to disperse the mists of delusion, and to place the truth in a clear light before a rising and inquiring posterity.

In regard to Mr. Campbell's *peculiar* sentiments, I have not had the means of knowing precisely what they are. Whatever they may be, they were not brought into this debate; for he took his stand, and kept it, on that firm ground which was occupied by the original Reformers, and on which Protestants of all denominations will readily agree with him. If he holds peculiar opinions which are injurious to this great cause, it is truly to be lamented; and we may hope that a good Providence will yet lead him out of such dangerous mistakes; for a mind like his ought always to be public property, as it was in the late famous discussion in the city of Cincinnati.

In conclusion, I will take the liberty to say, that I have no other feeling than that of affection and good will, both for Mr. Campbell and for his learned and ingenious opponent; and while my faith in Protestantism is confirmed, my charity for the Catholic communion is considerably enlarged. A. SHINN.

In order to complete this notice, we copy from the Daily Gazette of February 4th, a letter from Mr. Campbell, which the editor introduces with the following remarks:—

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

We publish to-day a communication from Alexander Campbell. It is fair to do so, and it is fair play to give it a hearing without an instant reply. But there are one or two things it behooves me to note, instantly. I shall expect Mr. Campbell to furnish me his authority for asserting, that I said he should have "*a damned hard time of it.*" I have no consciousness of the use of such language.

The reference to the gain or loss of subscribers, also, requires a word. In conducting the Gazette, no calculations of gain or loss are made, either by the Proprietors, or by the Editor. Thanks to an independent and free community, nothing of that sort is necessary to sustain the Gazette. Our efforts are, to make it a useful paper, and, at the same time, to give it a tone above truckling, in religion, morals, or politics. In this we are sustained.—We often offend our best friends, when, in the performance of what we esteem duty, we cross their paths. They discontinue for the moment—generally, they return. It is a fact, too, that, in every case of petulant discontinuances, the deficiency is supplied by those pleased with what has given offence to their neighbors.

MR. HAMMOND:

Sir—Will you permit one, whom you have not hitherto very civilly treated in your columns, to disclaim certain allegations which you have preferred against him?

That you have a right to form and express an opinion of me, is, on my side, indisputable; and, in this concession, I claim to myself the right to form and express an opinion of you, so far as your conduct towards me, in reference to the late discussion, demands.

That you have been long opposed to me, and that you have on other occasions, years since, dragged me unceremoniously into your columns, is rather of public notoriety: and that you have, at this time, suffered your prejudice to place you in no enviable attitude before the community, is, I think, a matter already too evident to yourself.

Digitized by Google

As to your opinion expressed, on this discussion, when it is known that you have for years denounced me as a heretic; that when the request, and my reply to the request, of many of the most respectable of your fellow-citizens, was handed you for publication in October last, you said, "Between the Catholics and (yourself,) (I) *should have a damned hard time of it;*" that you publicly, and *in print*, impugned my motives as *mercenary* and *vain;* that, on my arrival here, you announced this discussion as "*a war on the Catholics;*" that you associated me with Maria Monk, Rebecca Reed, (was it?) and what other horrible disclosures I know not; that during the whole discussion you did not hear one proposition discussed from beginning to end; that you only slipped in and out occasionally; and that you were then endeavoring to produce that public opinion of which you affected afterwards to be the organ: I say, when all this is known, your opinion expressed on the merits of the discussion, will be a positive advantage to the cause of Protestantism.

Think not, sir, that I either affect, or feel, that there is any need for me to appear in defence of myself against that opinion. The impartial and the intelligent public have already done me ample justice, even more than justice, as a man; and they will do, as they are doing, the cause, the great cause of Protestantism, ample justice, maugre the efforts of any individual. The debate, sir, will soon be public property, and will speak for itself: the whole country will then learn, better than I can tell them, how much honor Mr. Hammond has done his own judgment and general reputation, in his course on the present occasion.

This, sir, (can you believe it?) I regret on your account, and on my own: for, although I have long known your hostility to myself, permit me to say, that I have uniformly, on all occasions spoken (and many there are who can bear witness in the case,)---I have, sir, uniformly spoken of you as one of the most sagacious, talented, and independent politicians, and as a jurist inferior to no man in all the great West. I therefore regret that you should have so reprehensibly and glaringly committed yourself on the present occasion, and thus impaired public confidence in the soundness and temperance of your opinions.

But I am in your esteem, and in that of a certain pulpit, written down and proscribed as a foul "heresiarch." The good gentleman to whom you allude, and of whom I formed a very high opinion in the College of Teachers, is laboring under a morbid sensibility; or rather, is wholly ignorant of my views touching the matters of which he impeaches me. I frankly forgive his imputations. They flow from a mistaken view; and a little more acquaintance with me would make him more ashamed of himself than I am. But, sir, you say I am a great heresiarch. And what are you, pray? Every one active and earnest in the cause of religion, is a great heretic, or heresiarch, in the eyes of Satan, or---somebody else. You are yourself, sir, in the estimation of Bishop Purcell and his brethren; who, in sympathy, or in compassion for your editorial losses in this crusade against Protestantism, are said to have given you two crosses for every crown you have lost; two Catholic for every Protestant subscriber; and even canonized you, saying that their cause cannot be injured in the West so long as they have in heaven a Virgin Mary, and on earth Charles Hammond to plead it: I say, sir, that even these good and kind Catholic brotherhood call you a heretic, and your great ecclesiastic leader the great heresiarch of all the West! But, sir, what does al

Digitized by Google

this prove? Might I say to you that you do not at all understand my views and efforts? I have for many years been seeking to unite all Protestant Christians on one great bond of union, as Catholic as Protestant Christendom; and even on the subject of baptism, for which I have your sincere aversion, I am perfectly *catholic*. I contend only for that baptism which the Greek, Roman, and English Churches equally admit as apostolic and divine; and I regret only that which is SECTARIAN, or held by a part of Christendom, because it is partisan, and not catholic, and because it alienates and divides as great and as good men as this or any other age has produced.

I took up my pen, sir, not to argue any question in theology or politics with you, but to express my opinion of you, as frankly and as courteously as you have expressed your opinion of me; and to disabuse you of an *error* into which you have fallen in your guesses concerning the *authorship* of "*Civis*" and an "*Inquirer*."

In all benevolence, your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

February 3, 1837.

POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. II.*

IF there be strength in the everlasting hills—if there be power in the laws that bind the earth together—if there be might in the hand that launched the universe, and that grasps its various powers; then, indeed, is there power in that moral system of redemption which almighty love contrived and infinite compassion vouchsafed for the recovery of a ruined world. It is moreover intended by the benevolent Author of this religion, that this new power, moral and divine, should, with the scheme which it originated and perfected, be translated into the human heart, and that there it should unfold and gloriously display its almightiness in disenthralling, renewing, recreating, and saving not only the soul, but the man, from the overwhelming train of physical and moral evils consequent upon his apostacy from God.

Every truth in this divine system is animated and quickened by its intimate relation to the Spirit of the universe; and when written upon the heart, vitalizes the soul with a life forever new, forever fair, and forever blessed. This eternal life harmoniously pulsates with the supreme moral power, and uncreated fountain of all the life and all the felicity known and enjoyed through all the ranks of existence, celestial and terrestrial. Religious truth, sometimes called "the word of life," not only enlightens, but it

Digitized by Google

also enlivens the soul. The admission of it into the heart not only gives *light*, but it imparts *life:* "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." There is, then, an enlightening, animating, sanctifying, vivifying power in religion, both objectively and subjectively considered.

Take, for example, the truth which proclaims the omniscience, and consequent omnipresence of our God and Father; contemplate this truth as it stands related to us and to all the other truths in the evangelical economy. Man, with all the glory he assumes, and all the power and grandeur which he can appropriate from his admiring contemporaries, ever feels, and in all his lucid and sober intervals must confess, that he is an imbecile, frail, and helpless creature. He shrinks within himself in the presence of ten thousand dangers, and feels that, as a moth, he may be crushed every moment by various antagonist forces over which he can have no control. He fears not only the falling mountain, the fierce volcano, the earthquake, the mad tornado, the forked lightning, or the ravenous beasts of prey; but he fears the insensible malaria, the invisible miasmata, the pestilence that walketh in darkness secretly, the asp, the spider, and the gnat, which may poison life at its fountain, or sting him to death in an instant, amid all his watchfulness and care. All this he perceives and fears.

Awakened from the sleep of death and roused into thought, perceiving the character of a revealed God and Saviour, he finds among the attributes of his glory one that ineffably charms and strengthens him. It is the thought that this self-existent, omnipotent, and omniscient One, whose countless excellencies and glories no angelic tongue, no cherubic eloquence can unfold, is *omnipresent.* On this splendid discovery, he breaks forth into the enrapturing soliloquy—"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit! Whither shall I flee from thy presence! If I ascend into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hades, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead and thy right hand

Digitized by Google

shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me, even the darkness shall be light about me; yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee."

This discovery disarms danger of all its terrors, dispels ten thousand fears, and gives an impulse to the soul stronger than the fear of death—stronger than the love of mortal existence. But it is not the isolated thought that God is omnipresent that so invigorates and delights the soul: for no truth is solitary, no single attribute of God is abstract and independent of himself, or of his other excellencies; but it is the thought, the transporting thought that this God is my God, my Father, my strength, my life, my bliss; that through the mediation of his Son, the Lord Jesus, all his adorable perfections are pledged and promised to my defence, deliverance, and rescue from all evil. Boasting in this, the saint exclaims—

"How are thy servants blest'd, O Lord!
How sure is their defence!
Eternal Wisdom is their guide;
Their help, Omnipotence!"

Feeble though I am, says the Christian, the Lord Jehovah is my strength: he is my shield and my defence. Weak is my arm, but strong is his right hand. Short and indistinct my clearest vision; but he dwells in light: his eye irradiates the universe, illumines eternity, and watches over all his saints. He slumbers not, nor sleeps. His angels encamp around the dwellings of the righteous, and minister to the heirs of salvation. At his command,

"An angel's arm can snatch me from the grave."

And when the time of my deliverance comes—when the time of redemption draweth near,

"Legions of angels can't confine me there."

Embraced by the everlasting arms, the feeblest lamb in David's flock is strong as the Lion of the tribe of Judah. Thus the Christian is forever safe in the Lord, and strong in the power of his might.

The power of this single conception of God to beautify the soul, has never yet been adequately expressed. Time is "too short to utter all its praise." But it is not only precious because of its soothing and consoling power

—"To the stranger in distress,
The widow and the fatherless;"

Digitized by Google

but its sanctifying and restraining efficacy is equal to those prelibations of future bliss to which it elevates those in whose hearts it has a constant abiding. The thought that "thou God always seest me"—that,

"One glance of thine, Almighty Lord,
Pierces all nature through;
Nor heaven, nor earth itself, nor hell
Can shelter from thy view:

The mighty whole, each smaller part,
At once before thee lies;
And ev'ry thought of ev'ry heart
Is open to thine eyes."

This thought, I say, is a sovereign guard against impiety and immorality, as it is the oil of joy and the unction of peace to all the sons and daughters of distress. Like the burning cherubim that guarded the tree of life, so this consciousness of the Omnipresent Father, when healthy and vigilant, bids Satan, and temptation, and evil passion to stand aloof. It sanctifies and animates every place, and sheds a cheerfulness and delight wherever we place our foot. With the Poet of the "Seasons," he that has this thought ever present may sing—

"Should God command me to the farthest verge
Of the green earth—to distant barbarous climes,
Rivers unknown to song; where first the sun
Gilds Indian mountains, or his setting beam
Flames on the Atlantic isles: 'tis naught to me,
Since God is ever present, ever felt
In the void waste, as in the city full;
And where he vital breathes there must be joy.
When ev'n at last the solemn hour shall come
And wing my mystic flight to future worlds,
I cheerful will obey: there with new powers
Will rising wonders sing. I cannot go
Where Universal Love not smiles around,
Sustaining all yon orbs and all their suns;
From seeming evil still educing good,
And better thence again, and better still,
In infinite progression. But I lose
Myself in Him—in light ineffable.
Come, then, expressive silence, muse his praise!"

The following sketch from the biography of excellent women, found in my unpublished Museum, exhibits the point before me, and furnishes an illustration of the power of religion in, over, and among the world. It is but one of a hundred that might be introduced in practical confirmation of this great subject.

Digitized by Google

Mary Simpson had the misfortune to lose the husband of her youth after the birth of their third daughter. She was left with youth, and beauty, and a lovely character on her side; but she was poor and pennyless; and, still worse, a stranger in a foreign land, afar from all her acquaintance and relatives. In the hopes of bettering his fortune, her husband had carried her from England to one of the West India islands, and had been there but a few weeks till he was seized by the yellow fever, and died. Reduced to the greatest penury and distress, she was, by a rather singular train of things, taken into the family of a respectable and rich merchant, who, in some indescribable way, not long after her admission into his house, to try her principles, exposed to her view a considerable sum of money, under circumstances calculated to engender a variety of suspicion as to his motives and designs. He knew nothing of the peculiar excellence of his strange guest: he had only heard the story of her sufferings from one as ignorant of her piety as he was himself, and there appeared a mystery in her movements which he was curious to fathom. Before leaving his mansion she addressed to him the following note:—

'Sir—I thought your humanity had prompted you to inquire into the afflictions of an indigent and helpless female, whom a long train of unpropitious circumstances had first carried to your shores, and then left in your city, among entire strangers, afar not only from all her relations, but even acquaintance. Bereaved a few months since of the beloved companion of my choice; and, only a few weeks after, of the last pledge of his affection; and having spent the last farthing, on the verge of absolute want, when, only a single moon since, I received from the hand of your servant a few lines of condolence and an invitation to your house to wait upon your long-afflicted wife; I regarded you as an angel of mercy sent by that gracious Benefactor whom a pious mother had taught me to reverence and regard as ever with me from my earliest years. I accepted your invitation as coming from Heaven, not only as the means of affording me and my infant children present sustenance, but as promising, though at a distant day, the opportunity of returning to my native and beloved land, to my yet surviving mother and the friends and companions of my youth.

But, sir, from certain incidents of the last few days, and especially from the occurrence of this morning, I fear that I am not

Digitized by Google

where I ought to be, while under your protection. Meanwhile, you will please excuse the abrupt manner in which I now leave your residence to-day. I will again, (not knowing what may await me in this place, where the fear of my God seems to have no abiding, and destitute though I be,) I will throw myself upon his mercy which is covenanted to the widow and the fatherless that hope in him; and bid you adieu.

'MARY SIMPSON.'

Her sudden retirement from the palace of Merchant G—— to the solitary room which she had left, made her condition worse than it was before, because that gentleman was regarded as the most honorable as well as the most wealthy gentleman in the city. It was even affirmed that he was a religious man; and certain it was to all, that he was truly benevolent. She said nothing; but as she mused upon the dark picture before her, occasionally there fell from her lips these soul-reviving words, "Thou God seest me!"

She resumed her needle and her fortitude, and held fast her innocence and integrity; and by ways and means which she sometimes could not explain, her wants were anticipated and supplied. From some unknown quarter money and rich presents were often left upon her table; and although occasionally dark clouds flitted across her skies, she was never wholly dependent nor forlorn. And many an evening as the setting sun gilded the clouds and the waves of the Western Ocean, toward which her window looked, while she pressed her youngest daughter to her bosom, she was heard to sing in the sweetest strains—

"We all may like ships by tempests be tost
On the perilous deep, but cannot be lost;
Though Satan enrages the wind and the tide,
The Scripture engages *the Lord will provide.*

"The birds without barn or store-house are fed;
From them let us learn to trust for our bread:
His saints what is fitting shall ne'er be deny'd,
So long as 'tis written, *The Lord will provide.*"

Thirteen full months had thus passed without any material change in her condition. She never heard one word from Merchant G——, who had buried his wife some four or five weeks after her departure from his house. Sitting by her window one morning, reading the Psalms of David, she saw Mr. G—— ap-

Digitized by Google

proach her door. As soon as he was seated in her room, he informed her that he had called even at that late period to explain the circumstances which had so deeply affected her. He solemnly assured her that it was like Joseph in Egypt trying his brethren; that he only desired to ascertain what manner of spirit she was of; that, although it was unknown to her, he feared the God whom she worshipped, too much, to offend against the humblest of his children; and that in proof of his sincerity, he had now come to offer not only his hand but his heart to her in the place of his departed wife, at whose instigation, said he, I first invited you to my house. In doing this, continued he, I act not precipitately, nor at the impulse of the moment. I have made myself acquainted with your former history, and I have laid my case before Him whom I am accustomed to acknowledge in all my ways; and I am now resolved, with your concurrence, to make you the partaker of all my future fortunes. You know not, he added, how often for the last six months, in my morning and evening walks, my ear has lisened with raptures to your matin songs and your evening serenades; and how the ardor of your devotions has kindled in my bosom the flame not merely of affection for you, but of love to Him whose religion has planted such excellent principles in human hearts and thrown such a loveliness over human character.

Mrs. Simpson at these words burst into tears; and on recovering herself, said, It is enough. The hand of the Lord is now visible. Will you please call upon me again on this subject?

I need only add, continues the biographer, that Mrs. Simpson and Mr. G—— for many years lived the happiest life, enjoyed the most unmingled connubial bliss, and that they left behind them a well-educated and amiable family, whose influence and example reflect the greatest honor upon their memory and upon the Christian profession in the island of Bermuda. A. C.

SERIOUSNESS.

NOTHING IS SO CONTRARY TO GODLINESS AS LEVITY.—Seriousness consists in the matter of what is spoken, the manner of speaking, in dignity of behaviour, and in weighty, not trifling actions. Some

Digitized by Google

people are serious by nature, some by policy, and for selfish ends, and some by grace, and from a sense of duty.

Jesting and railery, lightness of behaviour, useless occupations, joy without trembling and awe of God, an affectation of vivacity and sprightliness, are all contrary to the spirit of God. A fool laughs loud, saith Solomon, but a wise man scarce smiles a little.

Levity is contrary to contrition and self-knowledge—to watching and prayer—frequently to charity—and to common sense, when death is at our heels.

Levity is destructive to all devotion in our own heart, and in that of others, by unfitting the company for receiving good, and bringing a suspicion of hypocrisy upon all.

Seriousness is useful to prevent the foregoing miscarriages—to keep grace—to recommend piety, and a sense of God's presence—to leave room for the spirit to work—and to check levity and sin in others.

And have we not motives sufficient to seriousness? Are we not priests and kings to God—temples of the Holy Spirit? Are we not walking in the presence of God—on the verge of the grave—and in sight of eternity?

All who walk with God are serious, taking their Lord for their example, and walking by scripture precepts and warnings.

But are we to renounce innocent mirth? Our souls are diseased. Are we to be dull and melancholy? Seriousness and solid happiness are inseparable. Is there not a time for all things? There is no time for sin and folly. *Vermont Telegraph.*

Neophyte's Department.

VOCABULARY OF SCRIPTURAL TERMS.

Mr. Editor,

I CORDIALLY approve the remarks of my friend U upon the nature and importance of definition. It is to be hoped that his suggestion relative to the explanation of biblical terms will be attended to. Meanwhile, in default of a more competent philologer, I venture to offer definitions of a few important words, and the views upon which they are founded. Should you deem them worthy of a place in the Harbinger, you are at liberty to publish them, with additional remarks, as you may think necessary.

Digitized by Google

MIRACLE.—*Verbal definition:* An event resulting from the exercise of supernatural power.

OBSERVATIONS.—A miracle, as defined by Mr. Hume, is "A *transgression*, of a law of nature, by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposal of some invisible agent." Dr. George Campbell, in his masterly refutation of Mr. Hume's Essay, objects to the use of the term "*transgression*" in the definition above quoted, as being inappropriate, inasmuch as it invariably denotes a criminal opposition to authority, which can have no place where the Divine Being is concerned. For "transgression" he accordingly would substitute "*suspension*."

As just definitions, being founded in justness of thought, are very necessary to the clear understanding of any subject, it may be worth while to observe, with all due deference to the acknowledged merits of Dr. Campbell as a critic, that even the phrase, "A *suspension* of a law of nature by a volition of the Deity," &c. is imperfect as a general definition of a miracle.

It is obvious that in many miracles there is more than a mere suspension of a law of nature. It is true that in some cases there may seem to be nothing more—as when the sun and moon stood still, in common parlance, at the command of Joshua—this being effected by the suspension of the rotary motion of the earth and moon, and the course of the latter in her orbit. But in most miracles there is, besides the suspension of a law or laws already existing, the super-induction of a new law, or operative energy, which produces new and perhaps directly contrary effects. And in some cases there may not be even a suspension of the law, but *an increase of its power*. Thus, while there was a mere cessation of motion in the case of Joshua, it was permitted to Hezekiah to choose whether there should be a cessation or an increase—whether the shadow upon the dial should go backward or forward; who replied, "It is a light thing for the shadow to go down ten degrees; nay, but let the shadow return backward ten degrees." The substitution of a law directly the reverse of that of nature, occasioning a retrograde motion of the earth, was, it seems, regarded by Hezekiah as more evidently miraculous, than a mere increase of the usual motion. And in changing water into blood, as in Egypt, by Moses; or into wine, as in Gallilee, by Christ, there was not a mere suspension of the law by which certain elements were combined in the form of water—a mere decomposition of water, but an actual transformation, requiring not only new principles or elements, but new laws of combination. It is evident, therefore, that the term *suspension* will not always apply, even admitting, what some would probably deny, that we could in strictness suppose nature to be at any time

Digitized by Google

without law, or that one law could be abrogated without substituting another.

Again: it has long been a question whether the exercise of miraculous power be restricted to the Deity; or in other words, whether the elect angels, together with Satan, and those beings who participated in his fall, do not possess this power. Mr. Hume's definition refers it to the Deity, *or an invisible agent*, and thus admits the possibility of its being possessed by other beings than the Deity.

In this view, it is argued that as angels possess a higher nature than men, and are "greater in power and might," it is quite possible for them to accomplish, by the simple exertion of the great power which is inherent in them, events wholly beyond the energy of nature, and that such events, being inexplicable upon natural principles, will of course be to us miraculous. It is granted, indeed, that this power will not be exerted by any of the heavenly host unless by the command of God, nor by Satan and the fallen angels except by his permission. But it is urged that if commanded or permitted to use their power, its effects will be to us miraculous. Hence the remarkable events brought to pass by the angels of God on various occasions; the signs wrought by the magicians of Egypt in opposition to those of Moses; the afflictions of Job, &c. not to mention the extraordinary actions of demons in the time of our Saviour, and the incidents of his temptation in the wilderness by Satan.

On the other hand, it is asserted that the angels of God receive miraculous power from him for the occasion, and that as to the alleged miracles of Satan, they are impostures brought about by sleight of hand, and cunning device. His 'power, and signs, and wonders' are those of falsehood; the miracles of Jannes and Jambres were optical illusions, and as to the temptation of the Saviour it was merely a vision. It would, they argue, undermine the foundations of the evidence of revealed religion if we were to admit the possibility of any being possessing miraculous power except the Deity, who may confer it at the same time upon such agents as he chooses to accomplish special purposes.

Into this controversy it is not my present purpose to enter, except so far as it concerns the definition of the term *miracle*. We may remark that angelic beings, whether fallen or in their first estate, certainly do possess superior power. Of this we are positively assured. It is a characteristic of their nature. We know not, indeed, its exact amount, nor how great events may be accomplished by it, but it is certain that the same language is employed to designate the miracles of the magicians as those of Moses; and the temptation of Christ is apparently as much a matter of history as any other incident of his life. We may well

Digitized by Google

question a theory which requires us to explain away many of the express sayings and plain narrations of the Bible. The transportation of Philip from the desert to Azotus is at once recognized as miraculous, yet the exhibition made to Christ of the kingdoms of the world, and his transportation to a pinnacle of the temple are certainly as great manifestations of power, and as far beyond the circle of natural causes. Satan, the great "Adversary;" the antagonist of archangels; the daring rebel against the Deity himself; and the enemy of man with whose inmost thoughts he seems acquainted, and to devour whom he goes about as a roaring lion, is a being of stupendous power. When permitted to exercise it, we may well suppose him capable of performing those prodigies, and wonders against which the Saviour has warned, as likely to deceive "the very elect," and those "great miracles" spoken of in the Apocalypse, (chaps. xiii. & xvi.) which deluded the inhabitants of the earth.

As it regards the evidences of revealed religion, this admission does not at all invalidate them. The fear of such a consequence arises from the supposition that it may be impossible to distinguish Satanic from Divine miracles. This distinction, however, can be distinctly drawn. The character of the agent employed; the object of the miracle, that is, whether it be benevolent or otherwise; the nature of the proposition which it may be designed to support, and the comparative greatness of the miracles which may be arrayed in opposition, will afford infallible criterions for deciding. "If there arise among you," says Moses, (Deut. xiii.) "a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder *come to pass* whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you," &c. In this case the nature of the proposition, "Let us go after other gods," became conclusive evidence of the source from which the display of supernatural power or wisdom proceeded. And in the case of the magicians of Egypt we have an illustration of the certainty to be derived from comparing the degrees of power exhibited in miracles. Here the magicians at length acknowledged themselves outdone, saying, "This is the finger of God!" Nor is the character of the event and the agent less conclusive, for wicked persons are not sent as messengers from God, and a malignant being will not employ his power for benevolent purposes.

By this means, then, it will always be possible to discriminate between Divine and Satanic power. God is holy, just, and good, and his character is impressed upon his miracles, as upon all his works. Satan also is discovered in the tendencies and objects of

Digitized by Google

his prodigies and signs. So with their respective agents; and, as to power, while Satan is potent, God is omnipotent; and as the rod of Moses swallowed up the rods of the magicians, so will the Divine power ever display its superiority.

In relation to this whole question, then, I have defined a miracle, *An event resulting from the exercise of supernatural power*—the word *supernatural* being in my judgment sufficiently indicative of miraculous occurrences, while it is sufficiently general in its signification to include them all.

L.

Prophetic Department.

——"We have the prophetic word more firm; to which you do well to take heed, as to a lamp shining in a dark place, till the day dawn, and the morning-star arise in your hearts."

FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

To him who loves to dwell upon the sublime prophecies of the Bible, there is no consideration more pleasing, no conviction more deeply engraven upon his mind, than the certainty of their fulfilment. Overwhelmed with astonishment at the illimitable extent and infallible precision of the Divine foreknowledge, his hopes are confirmed, and his consolations strengthened by a singular array of collateral evidence: while in contemplating the events of the past, he learns to anticipate the fortunes, and weigh the destinies of the future.

What history could be more minute than the prophecies concerning Christ, in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms! What description of his character and sufferings is more graphic than that of Isaiah! "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted; yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

Digitized by Google

He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth." What account more exact and affecting than that of David in the 22d psalm! "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? why art thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roaring?—All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him.—Be not far from me, for trouble is near: for there is none to help. Many bulls have compassed me: strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round. They gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion. I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. But be not thou far from me, O Lord: O my strength, haste thee to help me. Deliver my soul from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog. Save me from the lion's mouth; for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." What could be more perfectly accomplished! Yet the Jews, enemies of Christianity, are the depository and the guard of those very prophecies which identify the Messiah, and which their fathers have fulfilled in condemning him!

How strange the scene, when we see a proud and mighty king, as Ahab, arrayed in royal robes and attended by a brilliant retinue, going down to take possession of the vineyard of the murdered Naboth; and perceive, opposing himself to him, an Elijah, a persecuted outcast—a hairy man with a girdle of leather about his loins, announcing to him the sentence of retribution:—"In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine"! Yet the historian records that the chariot which received his blood was washed in the pool of Samaria, and that the dogs licked up his blood, according to the word of the Lord. Nor is the contrast less striking when we witness a shepherd-boy anointed by the venerable Samuel with the sacred oil, as the future king of Israel—"taken from the sheepfolds; from following the ewes great with young, to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance."

Digitized by Google

How singular it is to behold a prophet, as the aged Jeremiah, lift up his trembling finger against the powerful and ancient Egyptian kingdom, full of populous cities, warriors and armour, horses and chariots; rejoicing in her fertility, prosperity, and splendor, and hear him pronounce the doom: "The daughter of Egypt shall be confounded: she shall be delivered into the hand of the people of the north.—O thou daughter dwelling in Egypt, furnish thyself to go into captivity, for Noph shall be waste and desolate without an inhabitant."—"Yet," says the Lord by Ezekiel, "at the end of forty years will I gather the Egyptians from the people whither they were scattered, and I will bring again the captivity of Egypt, and I will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation, and they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations."—And how readily do history and experience attest the truth of the predictions!

And when we contemplate the strength of Babylon, the "glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," with her lofty walls and bulwarks, her thronging multitudes, her vast extent; her towers, her palaces; her hanging gardens, and her gates of brass, and know that no sooner did the despised and humble Isaiah lift up his voice against her than she perished forever, how admirable appear that Divine power and wisdom which are adequate to accomplish all things, and by the "weak things" of this world to confound those that are mighty—by "base things," yea, by "things that are not," to bring to naught things that are! How striking becomes the corroboration of the distant traveller who adopts the language of the Prophet to record that 'Babylon is as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrha: It is never inhabited, neither is it dwelt in from generation to generation; neither does the Arabian pitch tent there; neither do shepherds make their folds there: but wild beasts of the desert lie there: and their houses are full of doleful creatures, and owls dwell there and satyrs dance there.'

With regard to the remote events of the past, how strange is the declaration that God formed man of the dust of the ground! Yet experience teaches that man returns to the ground from whence he was taken. How remarkable the history of the deluge! Yet how fully is it confirmed by the discoveries and labors of geologists!

As it respects the future, how extraordinary at first appears the plain declaration of the Apostle, that 'the present heavens and the earth are kept *for fire* to a day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men'! How strange the assertion, so boldly made, that this firm earth, with her rock-ribb'd mountains and her vast unfathomed oceans, shall be destroyed by a universal conflagration! Yet well-known facts and the

Digitized by Google

discoveries of naturalists and philosophers tend to show that such an event (apart from the authority of prophecy) is both possible and probable. It is now a commonly received opinion that the earth at its centre is a mass of liquid fire. From various experiments it is discovered that the temperature increases in proportion as we descend into the earth. M. Arago lately descended a well in Paris which is 700 feet deep, and found the temperature increase in a ratio which would at no great depth occasion the fusion of metals. The deepest mine in Great Britain is that at Monkwearmouth, 1584 feet below the surface. Professor Philips of York who descended into it, ascertained that the temperature regularly increased in proportion to the depth. And the innumerable volcanoes which exist at the north and at the south, in mountains and in the ocean, tend to confirm the theory. How intense is that heat which sustains the flames of Hecla and boils the waters of the Geyser—a heat which the frost of Iceland cannot cool! How extraordinary is that fire which, while it caps the Andes and bursts from the craters of Etna and Vesuvius, produces at the same time sub-marine volcanoes—a fire which even the waters of the ocean cannot quench! And how evident the possibility of that event foretold by the Apostle for which such preparation exists! How ready the means! How easy to fire the train! "The day of the Lord will come," says Peter, "in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements burning, shall be dissolved; and the earth and the works that are upon it shall be utterly burned." All this, doubtless, could be effected by the hand of Omnipotence without any preparation; but this view is more consistent with that use of means displayed in breaking up the *fountains of the deep*, and opening the *windows of heaven* to produce a deluge; and the igniting that inflammable substance so abundant in the "slime pits" or bituminous reservoirs in the vale of Siddim, [see Gen. xiv. 10. xix. 28.] in order to destroy the cities of the plain. "Nevertheless we expect, according to his promise, new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Thus do the deductions of science, and the phenomena of nature tend to confirm the fulfilment of the prophetic word, in harmony with the testimony of history and experience and the assurances of faith.

R. R.

CHARACTER OF A REFORMER.

THE characteristics necessary to constitute a real and thorough-going Reformer, have always been the same in all ages of the world, and in every department of human life in which

Digitized by Google

men have been engaged. The same elements of character are necessary to a Reformer in science, in politics, and in religion; the same boldness, independence of mind, moral courage, unflagging energy, and untiring zeal. Dr. Chalmers has given us the prominent traits in the character of a religious, or "Christian Reformer," in the following sketch of the character of the great astronomer Newton, which he has so admirably, vividly, and ably portrayed in his works:—

"While he gets all his credit, and all his admiration for those articles of science which he has added to the creed of philosophers, he deserves as much credit and admiration for those articles which he kept out of his creed, as for those which he introduced into it. It was the property of his mind, that it kept a tenacious hold of every one position which had proof to substantiate it—but it forms a property equally characteristic, and which, in fact, gives its leading peculiarity to the whole spirit and style of his investigations, that he put a most determined exclusion on every one position that was destitute of such proof. He would not admit the astronomical theories of those who went before him, because they had no proof. He would not give into their notions about the planets wheeling their rounds in whirlpools of ether—for he did not see this ether—he had no proof of its existence—and, besides, even supposing it to exist, it would not have impressed, on the heavenly bodies, such movements as met his observation. He would not submit *his judgment* to the *reigning systems of the day*; for though they had *authority* to *recommend* them, they had *no proof*: and thus it is, that he evinced the strength and soundness of his philosophy, as much by his decisions upon those doctrines of science which he rejected, as by his demonstrations of those doctrines of science, which he was the first to propose, and which now stand out to the eye of posterity as the only monuments to the force and superiority of his understanding.

"He wanted no other recommendation for any one article of science, than the recommendation of *evidence*; and, with this recommendation, he opened to it the chamber of his mind, though AUTHORITY *scowled* upon it, and TASTE was *disgusted* by it, and FASHION was *ashamed* of it, and all the BEAUTEOUS SPECULATION OF FORMER DAYS was cruelly *broken up* by this new announcement of the better philosophy, and scattered like the fragments of an aerial vision, over which the *past generations* of the world had been *slumbering* their *profound* and *pleasing reverie*. But, on the other hand, should the article of science want the recommendation of evidence, he shut against it all the avenues of his

Digitized by Google

understanding—aye, and though all *antiquity* lent their *suffrages* to it, and all *eloquence* had thrown around it the most attractive *brilliancy*, and *all habit* had *incorporated* it with every *seminary* in Europe, and all *fancy* had *arrayed* it in *graces* of the most *tempting solicitation;* yet was the *steady* and *inflexible* mind of Newton proof against this whole weight of *authority* and *allurement;* and, casting his cold and unwelcome look at the *specious plausibility*, he rebuked it from his presence. The strength of his philosophy lay as much in *refusing admittance* to that which *wanted evidence*, as in giving a place and an occupancy to that which possessed it. In that march of intellect, which led him onwards through the rich and magnificent field of his discoveries, he pondered every step; and, while he advanced with a firm and assured movement, wherever the *light of evidence* carried him, he never suffered any *glare of imagination* or *prejudice* to seduce him from his *path.*

"Sure I am, that, in the prosecution of his wonderful career, he found himself in a way beset with *temptation* upon every side of him. It was not merely that he had the *reigning taste* and *philosophy of the times* to contend with; but, he expatiated on a lofty region, where, in all the giddiness of success, he might have met with much to solicit his fancy, and tempt him to some devious speculation. Had he been like the majority of other men, he would have broken free from the fetters of a chastised and sober understanding, and, giving wing to his imagination, had done what philosophers have done after him—been carried away by some meteor of their own forming, or found amusement in some of their own intellectual pictures, or palmed some loose and confident plausibilities of their own upon the world. But Newton stood true to his principle, that he would take up with nothing that wanted *evidence*, and he kept by his demonstrations, and his measurements, and his *proofs;* and, if it be true that 'he who ruleth his own spirit is greater than he who taketh a city,' there was won, in the solitude of his chamber, many a repeated victory over himself, which should give a brighter lustre to his name than all the conquests on the field of discovery, or than all the splendor of his positive achievements.

"I trust you understand now, that though it be one of the maxims of the true philosophy, never to *shrink* from a doctrine which *has evidence* on its side, it is another maxim, equally as essential to it, never to *harbor* any doctrine when this *evidence is wanting.* Take these two maxims along with you, and you will be at no loss to explain the peculiarity, which, more than any other, goes both to characterise and to ennoble the philosophy of Newton."

JNO. R. HOWARD.

PARIS, *Tenn.* January 25th, 1837.

Digitized by Google

Discussion of Universalism.

From the Magazine and Advocate of Feb 10.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.*

DEAR SIR—This controversy on the part of the Universalist, having by mutual agreement between you and Mr. Montgomery, and his choice of a substitute, devolved upon me, I am happy in finding the subject fairly open for discussion, and an opponent to contend with of acknowledged talents and high reputation as a controversialist, and I can not but hope that if our investigations are conducted with honesty and candor, good will result and the truth be promoted thereby.

You say that in former volumes you have fully established all your premises and conclusions on the subject of Universalism: but as you do not inform us what those "premises and conclusions" are, we are left in the dark concerning them. Nevertheless, as this doctrine continues to move on in its majesty, and is constantly accumulating strength in our land, I console myself with the conviction that those "premises and conclusions" were not such as to annihilate the doctrine.

You next say you shall dispose of what Mr. M. says on Mark xvi. 16. in a remark or two. After stating that he requires you to prove, in order to maintain your ground, "that a person once an unbeliever, once condemned, must always remain an unbeliever, always condemned," you deny that you are required to prove this; for you say, "I neither believe, teach, nor affirm any such proposition." Now, sir, this appears to me very singular: for it is certain that, if you "neither believe, teach, nor affirm any such proposition," you can neither believe, teach, nor affirm any thing from the text in opposition to Universalism: and you, therefore, introduced the text in your reply to "Spencer" for no other purpose but to throw dust in the eyes of your readers and make *them* believe, while *you did not believe it yourself*, that this text was a *formidable argument* against the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men. No Universalist believes that any individual of the human family will be saved *while he remains* in unbelief and condemnation: and if you do not maintain that unbelief and condemnation will endlessly remain, you *can not* maintain that the text stands opposed to the doctrine of final universal salvation.

But what seems not a little remarkable is, that, after indignantly disavowing your faith in the proposition which Mr. M. required you to prove, you should proceed, as you do, in an indirect, round-about and equivocal manner to try to *establish* that, or what you intend your readers shall understand as tantamount with that very proposition—i. e. you meant they should so understand you if you had any definite meaning in that curious construction which you give the text. After giving the text this equivocal construction you add: "But from this you dissent and interpret as follows: He that hears and believes the gospel, and is baptized, is saved; and so continuing, will always be saved—living, dying, and forever.—But he that on hearing it disbelieves it, and rejects it, and so continues all his life, is now condemned or damned; but shall hereafter be eternally saved. This is your interpretation if you dissent from mine." The above, sir, is entirely unworthy the head that endited or the pen that wrote it: and I seriously regret to see a man of your talents and standing attempt to fix upon your opponent a charge of which you certainly knew or ought to have known, he was not guilty. Neither Mr. Montgomery, nor any other Universalist ever adduced this text as proof of the doctrine of universal salvation. All he contended for was that the text did *not* prove *endless misery*, and therefore was not at all to your purpose. Nor have you in the least invalidated his argument. But you were doubtless aware that unless you could force him into an interpretation that would make him appear ridiculous, your point was lost and your argument completely nullified. But in attempting to evade the strength of his argument and to father an interpretation upon him which he never thought of, you appear to me to have stooped below the dignity of your station.

* See Millennial Harbinger for February, 1836, article entitled "*Everlasting Punishment.*" Also, last week's Magazine and Advocate.

Digitized by Google

Further on, you say, "You will, however, have the believer and the unbeliever, during this life in opposite states, but in the same state hereafter;—presuming no doubt, that during death, or after death, unbelievers will all become believers and obedient and good Christians. This being out of the Record, is to me a new revelation, which because of a defect in the evidence, I cannot believe." Now, my good friend, as I am fully satisfied that the defect is not in the evidence, but in the manner of your examining it, I will endeavor to correct your misapprehension by calling up a few witnesses from the Record, which you have evidently overlooked. The Record positively declares that God has promised with an oath, that all nations, families and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed in Christ, the promised seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. See Genesis xii. 13; xviii. 18; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 14; Acts iii. 25; Gal. iii. 8, 16; Heb. vi. 13, 14. The Record declares that God's will, pleasure, and purpose, are, that all men should be saved, come to the knowledge of the truth, and be gathered together or reheaded in Christ; and that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. 1 Tim. ii. 4; Eph. i. 9, 10, 11. The Record declares that "God hath spoken of the restitution of all things, by the mouth of all his holy Prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 21. The Record declares that the Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hands—the heathen for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession—and that all that the Father giveth him shall so come to him as not to be cast out. Psalm ii. 8; John iii. 35; vi. 37—39; xvii. 2. The Record declares that all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him—that all nations whom God has made shall come and worship before him and glorify his name. Psalm xxii. 27; lxxxvi. 9. The Record also declares that Christ gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time—tasted death for every man—is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world—is the Saviour of the world, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world—that he shall not fail nor be discouraged—the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand—he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied—shall reign till he hath subdued all things unto himself, and deliver up the kingdom to God the Father that God may be all in all—that Christ hath the keys of death and hell—is Lord both of the dead and living—that neither death, nor life, nor any other creature can separate us from the love of God in him—that death shall be swallowed up in victory—tears wiped from all faces, and every knee bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. 1 Tim. i. 6; Heb. ii. 9; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 14; John i. 29; iv. 42; Isaiah xxv. 8; xlii. 4; liii. 10, 11; Romans viii. 38, 39; xiv. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 28; Philip. ii. 10, 11; Rev. i. 18; xxi. 4.

Now, sir, as these promises and hundreds of other similar ones *in the Record* clearly and unequivocally assert the final subjection, obedience and happiness of all men, and the annihilation of death and misery of every kind, the clear and irresistible conclusion is, that, if the Record be true, and these promises are not fulfilled with regard to all men before death, they must be after death—if not during this life, they must be in a future. See Heb. ii. 8; 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, 20; iv. 6. And if these promises are all fulfilled in reference to the character and moral condition of all men, I am inclined to the opinion that you will not then be possessed of the spirit of the elder son in the parable, (Luke xv. 28,) and refuse to associate with even Pharao, Nero, Caligula, Heliogabulus, Judas, Voltaire, and their companions, any more than Ananias refused to associate with Saul of Tarsus, when it was told him, "Behold he prayeth."

In the two or three succeeding paragraphs of your reply to Mr. M. you make some attempts at argument and some at witticism, which in two or three instances might with effect be retorted upon yourself: but as they do not in my opinion at all affect the great leading questions at issue between us, I let them pass without remark.

I am glad that in your reply to Mr. Spencer, you so frankly conceded all that he contended for in reference to the meaning of the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Gehenna*, and gave them up, as being in themselves insufficient to teach the doctrine of endless misery. You have finally fixed upon the word *aion* and its derivatives as the strong hold, the last resort, or citadel to defend that dreadful doctrine. And I now come to consider what you say about this word and the other words adduced by Mr. Montgomery as being much stronger,

Digitized by Google

clearer, and more unequivocal in defining endless duration than the word *aion* and its derivatives.

But I must here in common with Mr. M. and I think with every well-informed biblical and literary critic, express my utter surprise at the declarations you made in your reply to "Spencer"—(see Harbinger for October, 1835,) that "if the words *olem, aionion*," etc., "applied to the destruction of the wicked, mean not duration without end, then have we no words in human speech that certify us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end:" and that "there is no word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked." Had these assertions, so entirely devoid of proof, proceeded from some rash, hair-brained youth, some theological tyro, I should not have been so much surprised. But they are from one who has the reputation of being a grave divine, a great biblical critic, and the theological champion of the West!

After quoting Mr. M's language concerning Romans i. 23; Hebrews vii. 6; and 1 Cor. xv. 53; where the phrases *incorruptible, endless life, incorruption*, and *immortality* occur, and his question, "Are these words applied to the punishment of the wicked?" you say, "I answer No, nor to the happiness of the righteous; nor to simple *duration* at all.—Two of them are substantives, and therefore cannot be used as epithets, viz. *immortality* and *incorruption:* and the other three apply to *beings* or material substances in reference to simple indissolubility; not one of them could properly be applied to a simple state of being, or to happiness or misery: for although the word "*endless*" might seem to be an exception, when the original word is considered it is not. It only *figuratively* signifies *endless*, as any one may see who will examine either the etymological import or the common use of *akatalutos* in Greek writers."

The above, sir, very clearly evinces the fact, that when one false position is taken it requires several more to sustain it; and after all, its foundation is but sand. I do marvel that you should have made such assertions, entirely unaccompanied by any attempt at proof. The word *akatalutos* is thus defined by Donnegan: "Not *loosened* or *destroyed, indissoluble, indestructible.*" Grove defines it thus: "fr. *a* neg. and *kataluo, to dissolve, indissoluble, firm, stable, binding*" Now, sir, will you have the goodness to inform us, if the word *akatalutos* signifies *firm, stable, indissoluble*, and *indestructible*, according to lexicographers, to what else it *can* allude *but to duration* when applied to *life*, as in Heb. vii. 16? Evidently it can allude to *nothing else*, or at all events, the idea of *permanent durability* is inseparable from it. This is the only text where the word occurs in the New Testament, and yet you say "it is not applicable either to happiness, or to simple *duration* at all"!

Aphtharsia, which occurs 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, and in several other passages in the New Testament, is defined by Donnegan thus:—*Imperishableness, immortality*. Grove defines it thus:—*Aphtharsia*, from *a*, negative, and *theiro* to *destroy, incorruptibility, incorruption, immortality*. Loveland, who for the most part follows Schleusner and Hedericus thus defines it:—*Incorruptibility, immortality*, "*corpus* interritus expers." The latter also defines *aphthartos*, which occurs Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 52; 1 Tim. i. 17; 1 Peter i. 4, 23; and iii. 4; thus:—*Incorruptible, undying*, "*corruptionis,, et interritus, expers.*"—Donnegan thus: *Incorruptible, immortal, eternal.* Loveland defines *athanasia*, which occurs 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; and 1 Tim. vi. 16; thus:—*Exemption from death or dissolution immortality.*

Here we have *eternal*, your favorite term for *endless*, obviously in its most full and unlimited extent of meaning, given as one of the definitions of *aphthartos* by a celebrated and standard lexicographer. *Akatalutos* in the only place where it occurs in the New Testament, is translated *endless*, and can obviously signify nothing *less* than that; and yet you affirm of *all* the foregoing Greek words that neither of them is applied, or applicable, "to the happiness of the righteous or to simple *duration at all*"! One of your reasons for that opinion is singular enough, indeed. Forsooth, "two of them are *substantives*, and therefore cannot be used as epithets!" Suppose, sir, the Apostle had used the word *eternity*. By parity of reasoning, that could not be applicable to *duration at all*, because

Digitized by Google

it is a "*substantive*, and therefore cannot be used as an epithet!" Suppose (to illustrate the use of substantives without adjectives or epithets) I were to say to my friend, I am in a state of complete *felicity*. My friend states my declaration to you, and undertakes to show that I am very *happy:* but you laugh at him for entertaining such a thought; for you tell him that as *felicity* is a "*substantive*, it cannot therefore be used as an epithet," and for this reason, is not at all applicable to *happiness!* Now, sir, to me your reasoning in reply to Mr. M. appears precisely of this character. For the denial that *felicity* is applicable to express *happiness*, because it is a *substantive* and not an *epithet*, is no more illogical or ridiculous than is your denial that *aphtharsia* and *athanasia* are applicable to *duration*, because they are *substantives* and cannot be used as *epithets*, when it is clearly proved that the idea of *perpetual duration* is necessarily included in the meaning of the words.

Can any enlightened person acquainted with the meaning of the terms employed, read in 1 Cor. xv. St. Paul's description of the resurrection of the dead, to a state of *glory*, *honor*, *power*, *incorruption*, *immortality*, *imperishableness*, *indissolubility*, *indestructibility*, &c. and then honestly say he believes these terms have no applicability whatever, either to the HAPPINESS of the righteous, or to DURATION? The thing is impossible: What else could the Apostle have had in view in the use of all these terms, but the complete HAPPINESS of the resurrection state and the ENDLESS PERPETUITY thereof? Evidently these were the two most PROMINENT POINTS at which he aimed. If the idea of happiness was not embraced in this description, why does Paul exult in the prospect that this event would swallow up death in victory? Is not the kingdom of God (which the Apostle defines to be RIGHTEOUSNESS, PEACE, AND JOY IN THE HOLY SPIRIT) a kingdom of HAPPINESS? He says, verse 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit (APHTHARSIAN) incorruption," a perfect parallelism in which he uses APHTHARSIAN as synonymous with the kingdom of God; and yet according to you, the term is inapplicable to HAPPINESS! What was Peter speaking of, 1st Epist. i. 4. but HAPPINESS, perfect in its nature and ENDLESS in duration, when he speaks of "an inheritance incorruptible, (APHTHARTON,) undefiled, (AMIANTON,) and unfading, (AMARANTON,) reserved in heaven for you"? Is not the inheritance of which Peter speaks, "a state of being"? a state of HAPPINESS? and of PERMANENT DURATION? Most assuredly all three. And yet Mr. Campbell roundly asserts that "not one of them (the three terms including APHTHARTOS) could properly be applied to a simple state of being, or to happiness or misery!" The more I reflect on this declaration, the more I am astonished that it should have ever been made by you. It was evidently made when driven to a most distressing strait.

You evidently saw the impossibility of fairly maintaining your position, and therefore to nvalidate the force of the word AKATALUTOS, you state that "it only FIGURATIVELY signifies ENDLESS," and attempt to make your readers believe that it does not legitimately and naturally have this meaning. And what is not a little curious, you immediately proceed to the consideration of AIONIOS, everlasting, your strong hold, and undertake to maintain that this word can only be used in a LIMITED sense when used FIGURATIVELY, but that when "taken in its fair and LITERAL import" it uniformly signifies ENDLESS!

This curious manœuvre of yours, touching the LITERAL and FIGURATIVE meaning of these words, is in my view calculated directly to mislead your readers, instead of enlightening them with the true meaning of the words. For I maintain that the word AKATALUTOS and the other Greek words above defined, are never in the New Testament applied either LITERALLY or FIGURATIVELY, to things and objects of a perishable nature or limited duration; but uniformly to things and subjects of permanent and ENDLESS DURATION. And I furthermore affirm that the Hebrew OLEM and Greek AION, AIONIOS, and their parallels, are literally and far more frequently used to signify a LIMITED, or an INDEFINITE period of time, than ENDLESS DURATION; and further, that they NEVER literally and strictly signify ENDLESS DURATION in the Scriptures unless there is something in the NATURE OF THE SUBJECT to which they are applied, which ABSOLUTELY REQUIRES and NECESSARILY FIXES THIS MEANING UPON THEM: and I call on you to disprove either of these assertions. Point me to a single passage in the Bible, if you can, where AKATALUTOS, APHTHARTOS, APHTHARSIA, or ATHANASIA, are applied either to mere things of earth, or to a state or condition

Digitized by Google

of punishment, misery or unhappiness, or to *any* subject of *limited duration*. Point me if you can, to a single text where *aionios* signifies *endless*, unless the nature of the subject *absolutely requires it*. So much for your *figurative* and *literal* construction of those Greek words. And yet you affirm that "there is no word in human language that expresses duration without end which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked!" Nevertheless, you can find no stronger term by which to express the endless duration of punishment than the Greek *aionios*, confessedly one of the most ambiguous words in all the Bible! Nay, to add to your difficulties and embarrassment, you have not been able to adduce a single passage from the Bible, where even *this* word, ambiguous as it is in meaning, is clearly and obviously applied to punishment in a future state of being! But though as a matter of indulgence, I were to grant that you might find a passage or two that spoke of *aionian punishment*, even in another state of being, it would devolve on you, before such passages could avail you any thing, to prove that there was something in the *nature* of punishment that necessarily required it to be *endless* in duration. But "this, give me leave to say with all emphasis, no living man can do. I feel myself logically, grammatically, as well as theologically and religiously compelled to affirm this proposition —that in reference to things mundane, or to things of this life," and in reference to *all punishment*, consequent of the aberrations and follies of men in this life, the words *aionios*, *everlasting*, etc. are used in their strictly *literal* and *legitimate*, but yet in a *limited* sense, from the very nature of the subjects to which they are applied.

Your constant and overweening, yet fruitless efforts throughout your reply to Mr. M. to make it appear that *olem*, *aionios*, *everlasting*, etc., when used in their unfigurative, common and literal sense, must necessarily signify *endless*, and whenever used in a limited sense must be used *figuratively*, clearly evinces how important you thought this point to the successful maintainence of your ground, and yet you are unable to adduce a particle of evidence in favor of this assertion. But you seem over-anxious to press Mr. M. into an acknowledgment of the propriety of this construction. And why? Because, as you pretend, if this is not conceded, the application of the terms to God, "will undeify our Creator and annihilate the universe!" Do not be alarmed, my good sir, the Creator shall not be undeified, (nor do I intend he shall be *demonized*,) nor the universe annihilated. I will freely grant you that God is self-existent, and necessarily endless in his being, and that, entirely independent of the application to him of the Greek *aionios*, or the English *everlasting*.

Suppose, sir, I hear a person speak of a *great man* and the *great God;* I say to him, Sir, I suppose you use the word great only in a figurative sense when applied to the man, but in a strictly *literal* sense when applied to God. "No," says he, "I use it *literally* in both cases—I do not use it *figuratively* in either of these or any similar case. The word when applied to God, signifies *infinitely great*, not from the original and natural import of the word, but from the necessity of the case, because we know God *is* infinitely great, and in no sense can he be considered finite or limited. But it is used literally, though in a comparative sense when applied to man, and the word *great* (which takes its peculiar meaning from the nature of the subject to which it is applied) is much more frequently applied to finite beings and things than to the infinite Creator." I start back in horror and exclaim, Alas! sir, you have "undeified the Creator," reduced him to a level with a mere man, and thereby "annihilated the universe!" This, sir, would place me in precisely the condition in which your argument places you.

What, sir, have we no evidence of the endless perpetuity of God, angels, saints and happiness, but what is derived from the force of this very equivocal and ambiguous word *aionios*, which is applied to the priesthood of Aaron, to the covenant of circumcision, to the possession of the land of Canaan, to a man's life-time, to the three days during which Jonah was in the whale's belly, to hundreds of things which have had or from their nature must have an end, and which the best of lexicographers say is "used to express a *limited time*," and "seems to be *much more frequently* used for an *indefinite* than for an *infinite* time"? (*See Parkhurst.*) Thanks be to God, my hope rests on a firmer and better foundation than this.

Digitized by Google

For not only have we the Greek words applied to God and the future condition of mankind, which I have before shown are never applied to earthly things or any thing of a perishable nature or limited duration, by which to prove the endless existence of God and happiness; but further we know that as God is self-existent and independent of all other causes and beings, he must necessarily exist *ad infinitum, endlessly*—no cause can operate to destroy his existence. He is the I AM. In him *life* and *happiness* are without beginning and must be without end; therefore, they are strictly eternal and endless in their nature, being original and essential in God. Man is the *offspring*, the *child* of God. God is the Father of *all spirits*. Christ is the Mediator: in him is *life:* and this life is the light of men. He is the head of every man. Ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God. Because he lives ye shall live also. Man's life and happiness will be strictly endless, because founded in and derived from God. Christ says of men in their resurrection and beatified state, "*Neither can they die any more;* for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke xx. 36. St. Paul speaks of a "kingdom which cannot be moved"—*asaleuton, immoveable.* Heb. xii. 28. St. Peter speaks of "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that *fadeth not away*, reserved in heaven;" and of "a crown of glory that *fadeth not away.*" 1 Pet. i. 4; v. 4. We read, Isaiah xlv. 17, "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded *world without end.*" But where, sir, do we read that the punishment of the wicked shall continue *world without end?* Where do we find any thing tantamount in expressing duration, to those words and phrases that are applied to the happiness of heaven? No where in the Bible. But look, sir, to the following words of Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 17; where he out-does and goes if possible beyond all which he had before said in regard to the happiness of the saints: "For our present light affliction worketh for us *kath hyperbolen eis hyperbolen, aionion baros oxes katergazetai emin:* a glory *exceeding aionion to an excess.*" Here is an hyperbole upon an hyperbole; *beyond eternal;* a *far more* (or *excessively*) *exceeding aionion*, weight of glory. How entirely prostrated, sir, is your reasoning here shown to be. For if, as you say, *aionion* when applied to things of another world, or "beyond the confines of time and sense," always and necessarily signifies *endless;* how could its duration be exceeded, and that by an *extraordinary excess*, as expressed in the text? It is evident that Paul did not consider it as signifying *endless;* for what is *endless* can have nothing *beyond* it; and furthermore, when he wants to express a greater duration than *aionion*, and still not express absolute eternity, he uses the *double plural tous aionous ton aionon*, or ages of ages, which neither he, nor any other scripture writer, would have done, had the word *aion* of itself or any of its derivatives signified strictly *endless.*

Thus, sir, it is clearly demonstrated that the words *aion, aionios*, etc., do not of themselves naturally express *endless duration;* and it devolves upon you to prove from the *nature of the punishment itself*, that it is and *necessarily must be endless in duration*, before *aionios*, when applied to punishment, can be allowed to have the signification of endless. But this, I have said, neither you nor any living man can do. Nay, more, I will volunteer, on the other hand, to prove that punishment, from its very nature, must be limited and *cannot* be endless in duration.

What is punishment? Had it a beginning? If so, when and where? Did it have its root, its fountain, its origin and being in God? Certainly not. It is not co-eternal with God.—It has not its fountain and root in him, as have mankind, and as have life and happiness.—It is the effect or consequence of the finite actions, of finite beings, in a finite space of time. It is the sad inheritance of the sins and frailties of frail mortals, for their departures from duty and their violation of the revealed will and laws of God. Has God any pleasure in it? No, not the least. See Isaiah lv. 1, 2, 3, 7; lvii. 16—18; Lam. iii. 33; Ezek. xviii. 32; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4. Then will he not perpetuate it to all eternity. He will finish sin, make an end of transgression, (which, since the creation of man and contrary to his law, have sprung up to mar the happiness of his children,) and reclaim all his alienated family, so that universal holiness and consequent happiness shall at length prevail, which alone accord with the divine will and nature. There is no possible ground on which you can

Digitized by Google

raise even a plausible argument in favor of the endless perpetuity of punishment, unless with Zoroaster and other heathen philosophers, you maintain that there are *two* Divinities, *co-eval* and *co-eternal*, the one the author of all good and the other the author of all evil; and therefore, that, as evil is of as long standing as good, it will be co-eternal with it. But this you will never attempt

I may now vary and return your language thus: Were we to force the meaning of *endless* upon the word *aionios* as applied to the punishment of the wicked, contrary to the obvious design of God and all the inspired writers, (and endless misery should prove *true*,) if it did not "unDeify our Creator and annihilate the universe," it would *transform our Creator into a fiend of infinite cruelty, clothe heaven in sackcloth and mourning, and fill the universe with sighs and tears*—which would be a much more deplorable event.—But this can never be: for God is *God*, and not man. Your system of endless sin, and misery, and evil is therefore completely prostrated, nor can its shattered fragments ever be gathered up again; no, not even by your own extraordinary powers. The kingdom of darkness and death shall terminate, and man universally be happy and free. And even you, yourself, will yet join with me in celebrating the happy and glorious event. Amen.

The remark I made about your unfairness and disingenuousness in ascribing to your opponent the ridiculous construction of Mark xvi. 16. which you did ascribe to him, and which neither he nor any other Universalist ever thought of putting on the text, will apply with equal propriety to what you say in your last paragraph but two, about Matt. xxv. 41. If you, sir, are incapable of conceiving how the protracted PUNISHMENT of the wicked can be DISCIPLINARY and CORRECTIVE, and therefore ultimate in good, (though we never thought of attempting to reclaim the devil by it, but calculated on his destruction; see Heb. ii. 14.) you might possibly obtain some light on the subject by applying to some reformed convicts from the State Penitentiaries.

I thank you for your "left hand compliment" to the Quakers and Universalists from the writings of Thomas Paine, and beg leave still further "to amend the bill, by substituting" *Advocate of endless misery* in place of *Universalist*. For full well am I satisfied the doctrine of endless misery has made more deists and infidels than all the writings of Thomas Paine twice told. Robert Owen, your quondam opponent, his son Robert Dale, Paine, Carlisle, and Taylor, and Frances Wright, and nearly all their coadjutors in Europe and America, were brought up and nurtured in the faith of endless damnation. And what, sir, but that horrid doctrine and the erroneous supposition that the Bible taught it, led them to reject the Bible and with it the whole of Christianity. Robert Dale Owen says he was "brought up a Presbyterian of the strictest sect," and that "the doctrine of ENDLESS PUNISHMENT was the first thing that staggered his young credulity!" It is related of Lord Shaftsbury, that on asking Bishop Burnet if the doctrine of endless torment was actually taught in the Bible, and being answered in the affirmative, he immediately replied, "I cannot embrace a system which inculcates a doctrine so utterly opposed to all just ideas of the character of the merciful Ruler of the universe." And many a good and benevolent mind, permit me to say to you, sir, has come to the same determination. Taking it for granted, from the testimony of their religious teachers, that the Bible teaches the horrid doctrine of endless sin and woe, they at once reject the whole as utterly unworthy of a God of benevolence and wisdom. And the transitions from the doctrine of endless misery to deism, are in my opinion as NINETY NINE to ONE when compared with the number of those who go from Universalism to Deism; while it is a well-known fact that Universalism has reclaimed many an infidel to the faith of the gospel, when nothing else could have done it but God himself.

Let Christianity be stripped of all heathen dogmas, and all doctrines of human invention, and especially of the God-dishonoring and soul-withering system of endless sin and suffering, which I have shown is no part of revelation, and stands directly opposed to the Bible, and let the gospel be presented to man in its purity and divinity, as a system of universal love and grace, worthy of a God of infinite wisdom, and power, and goodness, and it will, it must be received: yea, many an infidel will then be reclaimed, and with tears of grateful joy will exclaim,

Digitized by Google

"Should all the forms that men devise,
Assault my faith with treacherous art,
I'll call them vanity and lies,
And bind the gospel to my heart."

Yours with all due respect,

D. SKINNER.

[Mr. Campbell's return from Cincinnati having been unexpectedly delayed, his reply to Mr. Skinner will not be in time for the present number.] R.

Sketches of Religious History.

QUAKERS OR FRIENDS.

As an item of interest in the history of the Society of Friends, we republish the following Advertisement and Letter of resignation, by *Elisha Bates*. From these it will be seen that Truth and Reformation are ever opposed by the old weapons of misrepresentation, injustice, and detraction; and that no one can presume to prefer the teachings of Christ, in the divine oracles, to the dogmas and opinions of any religious community, without incurring their undisguised hostility. R.

Letter of Resignation of the Right of Membership in the Society of Friends, addressed to Short Creek Monthly Meeting—by ELISHA BATES.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The following Letter was presented to the Monthly Meeting which was held at Short Creek, on the 21st inst. when the Charges referred to in it, were received from the Preparative Meeting.

Two individuals were requested to go out and examine it, to see if it was suitable to be read. When they came back, they neither returned the letter, nor gave any report, or information respecting it.

In this proceeding there was not only a manifest departure from good order, but an act of disrespect both to the writer of the letter, and to those to whom it was directed. Every man has an undeniable right to leave a society with which he may have been in connexion. And if so, he has a *right to be heard*. To refuse this privilege is an assumption of Church Power, inconsistent with the understanding of the age in which we live. And those to whom the letter was addressed were the proper judges of its suitableness to the occasion. It was both their duty and their right to have heard what I had said. But it is an evil of increasing magnitude in the Society of Friends, that the most important

Digitized by Google

matters are disposed of by a *few*, while the great body of the members do not understand what is going on.

The Charges got up by the Preparative Meeting are as follows, which, to be better understood, I have numbered.

1. "The Overseers inform that Elisha Bates has written and published an Address to Friends of Ohio and Indiana Yearly Meetings, which relates to our religious principles and testimonies, without the advice and concurrence of the Meeting for Sufferings.

2. "Also has written and has published a Pamphlet in England, An Appeal to Friends, which exhibits the most insidious attempts to destroy the Society, and George Fox's Christian character and religious reputation, by calling in question the soundness of his religious writings.

3. "He has denied the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit independent of the Scriptures, as it appears by his late publications; therefore he is not one in faith with us.

4. "He acknowledges himself to have submitted to the rite of Water Baptism, and in this he has violated a well-known principle of our Society."

When the subject was introduced into the Meeting, by reading the foregoing charges, some discussion took place, and various changes in the charges themselves were proposed. But the Meeting could agree in none, except in leaving out the *third* charge altogether. The others remained as sent up, and a committee was appointed to treat with me on them.

But as the Resignation of Membership in the Society was complete on my part, the Letter is now offered to the public, not only for the information of the members of the Monthly Meeting of Short Creek, but of the whole Society, and the community at large.

A Summary View of the Case, embracing a Reply to the foregoing charges, will shortly be published.

E. BATES.

Mount Pleasant, 2nd Mo. 22, 1837.

MOUNT PLEASANT, 2nd mo. 20th, 1837.

To Short Creek Monthly Meeting:

DEAR FRIENDS—I have now, for upwards of four years, suffered an almost unexampled course of unkindness from those I had regarded as my friends. The causes of this, so far as I am able to speak with confidence, have been:

1. My holding the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures *as conclusive* in all matters of Faith and Practice; and preaching the leading doctrines contained in them—constantly holding, at the same time, that no doctrine which is contained in the Scrip-

Digitized by Google

tures should be rejected, nor any doctrine that is not contained in them be believed or promulgated.

2. For cautioning my friends against those errors in regard to fundamental doctrines, which have been productive of the most lamentable consequences in the Society; and which are still exerting a deadly influence—clothed, as they were in the late schism, with the character of the *Spiritual Views of Early Friends.*

Called, as I believe I have been, by the Head of the Church, to testify the gospel of the grace of God, I have been engaged to promulgate those blessed doctrines which are recorded in the Scriptures; and to warn against those things which appeared to operate against a free and heartfelt reception of them. Of this description are sentiments and forms of expression, which lie scattered through the writings of our Early Friends; and also that implicit confidence in them which would recognize those writings as the *depositories* of the true meaning of Scripture. I have believed it to be my duty to show that this confidence rests on a false foundation—is fallacious in principle, and pernicious in practice.

Deeply sensible of the infirmities of human nature, for which I was willing to make large allowances to our Early Friends, I have desired that we might escape their weakness, and correct their mistakes, by a recurrence to the revealed Will of God—receiving the doctrines as there taught, and seeking the help of the Holy Spirit, to write them on our hearts, to give us access to God through Jesus Christ, to shed abroad in our hearts the love of God, and to lead us in the way of the obedience of Faith.

For these causes my religious reputation has been assailed, by various modes of private detraction. And when the minds of Friends were prepared for it, official measures were taken, affecting both my moral and religious character, and plainly intended to result in my disownment.

These measures were either *without* discipline, or *contrary* to its provisions.

Immediately after the Document of the Meeting for Sufferings had been abandoned, and the charge which was got up at the Preparative Meeting by a combination of committees, had been shown to be futile and untenable, a company was called out of the Monthly Meeting consisting of members of various committees, the overseers of the Monthly Meeting, &c. in which a new set of charges was agreed upon—which was afterwards presented to me by the overseers of this Meeting, laid before the Preparative Meeting, and by that forwarded to you.

This whole proceeding was out of order, and subversive of those privileges which the Discipline was intended to secure.

Digitized by Google

This set of charges is divided into *four heads*. The *first* relates to a material part of the Refutation of the Document, by which I proved myself to be in the *right*, and the Meeting for Sufferings to be in the *wrong*. By the publication of the Address it is shown that the opposition which was made to it, was to the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead and the Day of Judgment, *as set forth in Scripture language*. It shows also that the statement in the Document, that it contained "*few* or *no* quotations" from our acknowledged works, is *incorrect*. To bring forward this charge was contrary to the Scripture which says, "Keep thee far from a false matter: and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked." Ex. xxiii. 7. The *second* charge assumes that the *writings* of George Fox are not to be *called in question:* having particular reference, though not exclusively, to the extracts which I have lately made both from his manuscript and printed Journal, in a pamphlet entitled "An Appeal to the Society of Friends." And in the face of the most mortifying facts, it so fully takes upon the Society, the responsibility of those extracts, and of his religious writings without limitation, as to represent the calling of them in question as an insidious attempt to *destroy* the Society—and as such, a disownable offence.

The *third* head is in terms that I may not understand. And when I asked the overseer who presented it, for the ground on which it rested, he gave me no distinct reply. If it means that I do not believe we are warranted to expect a *revelation* of the *doctrines of Christianity*, independent of the Scriptures, it is *true*. If it means that I deny the immediate work and witness of the Spirit, in the heart, it is *not true*. I *never* denied that doctrine, and I trust never shall. If this is the idea intended to be conveyed, I unhesitatingly pronounce it *false*.

The *fourth* head, relating to Baptism, places the Society in a strongly marked opposition to the commandments and example of the Apostles, and to the practice of the church while under their immediate direction, and while in the possession of the highest degree of spirituality, and the most extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, ever conferred on the church. To suppose the ordinances have *ceased in point of obligation*, is one thing. To make the observance of them *a disownable offence*, is another. The first I believe is unwarranted by Scripture, and contrary to the practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Churches. The second I apprehend is a *new thing* in Christendom.

While these things have been going on, persons in prominent stations have been countenanced in preaching and otherwise promulgating doctrines identical with those of Elias Hicks. And on the other hand, many estimable members of the Society, who

Digitized by Google

were known to maintain the doctrine of Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and Justification by Faith, have been subjected to various harrassing proceedings, to discourage them from promulgating those doctrines, to destroy their influence, and finally to put them down.

After the unhappy effects of many passages in the writings of Early Friends had been exemplified in the late separation, and after the attention of the Society had been called to the danger of the same things, those very writings have been earnestly recommended to Friends generally, and especially to the youth—without any discrimination, or any caution, against the unsound or unguarded sentiments and forms of expression which are scattered through them. And not only so, but the Doctrinal Treatises of the early Members of the Society, which really contain the most objectionable passages, have been recognized as in *strict accordance* with the Holy Scripture.

I object to the course of proceeding against myself—and complain of the unkindness, and the unfairness with which they have been marked. And I protest against the dissemination, and recognition of unsound doctrine, and the opposition which in various ways has been made to that which is sound. And I exceedingly regret that the Society, by a combination of measures, should have fixed upon itself a character so decidedly opposed to Primitive Christianity.

My principles have been openly held. When I have found an opinion to be contrary to Scripture, I have abandoned it; while the doctrines which I believed to be established by that authority, I have maintained without fear, and without compromise. I have sincerely endeavored to promote a Christian reformation in the Society—without walking in craftiness, or handling the Word of God deceitfully. And now, as the Society, in its official capacity, has shown a determination to reject both me and my labors, I feel no disposition to impose myself upon it. And though I am fully sensible that there are many individuals in the Society, who truly love the Lord Jesus Christ, yet the official acts of the Body have fixed upon it a character with which I dare not be identified.

I therefore have concluded, painful as the conclusion is, to offer you the RESIGNATION OF MY RIGHT OF MEMBERSHIP in the Society of Friends.

I do not take this course to prevent investigation; for it is my intention, at a suitable time, and that before long, to publish a Summary View of the Case, embracing a reply to the new charges. And I shall always hold myself ready to meet any official member of the Society, or any individual whose name I may have used, in a fair and friendly investigation of any doctrine I hold, or any fact I may have stated.

Digitized by Google

And now, in the dissolution of the bond by which we have been bound together in a social relation, I desire that *that* charity, which is an essential part of vital religion, may suffer no diminution.

I do not feel myself as placed without the pale of the church. I recognize the true believers in the Lord Jesus, whatever may be their denomination—and I trust that I shall be recognized by them. I trust that in the common faith, the language will be reciprocated, "One is our Master, even Christ, and all we are brethren." May they know more and more of the consolation in Christ, the comfort of love, and the fellowship of the Spirit—and increase and abound in those Christian virtues and works of righteousness, by which our Heavenly Father is glorified.

"Christ loved his church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, and present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing." The work of reformation and the purging away of corruptions, arise from the love of Christ. And happy will it be for those who do not despise his love, or resist his work of purification.

Assured beyond all doubt, that the hand of the Lord is at work to carry on a Reformation, and extend the Redeemer's kingdom in the earth—by the revival of vital Christianity as it was presented to the world by the Son of God and his Apostles—I cannot believe that it will be frustrated. The instruments which he may be pleased to employ by some may be despised, but which he is able to sustain and bless. With this persuasion, I throw myself on his unfailing grace, and leave events to his unerring wisdom.

With deep sorrow for the present state of the Society—with earnest desires for the effectual conversion of those by whom its affairs are conducted—and tender sympathy with its sound and suffering members,

I remain your friend,

ELISHA BATES.

News from the Churches.

LEXINGTON, Mo. January 31, 1835.

ON my arrival here in October, 1835, I found all the churches near this quite sectarian and exceedingly hostile to what they called 'Campbellism.' The clergy of every order had taken great pains to forestall public opinion, and fill the minds of their flocks and the people with prejudice. However, during the winter I found a few disciples that were willing to be built on the foundation laid by the Apostles. I also

Digitized by Google

became acquainted with a brother Duke Young, who was formerly of the Christian order, and who was laboring in word and doctrine. Through his assistance in April last we established a little congregation of 18 disciples. Since that time we have added by letter 16, most of whom are amongst the first characters in the country. When we first congregated we met with great opposition: it seemed that the sectarians were determined to sink us in infancy. Misrepresentations were their weapons—weapons too weak to oppose truth! We firmly met their attacks, and invited the public to compare our course with the scriptures. Prejudice I think is giving way. Truth is mighty; and, in hands of disciples filled with the Holy Spirit, must prevail. Our principal object through the summer past has been to disabuse the public mind. However, I trust in the Lord that the good seed sown will be like the bread cast upon the waters, that will be gathered many days hence. We are greatly deficient in public teachers. Brother Young is the only public teacher of any note in four counties. He is a man of excellent Christian character, and sound in the faith. If circumstances would allow, you could do much good in visiting this country, by removing prejudice and setting the churches in order. We have, for a new country, considerable facilities for travelling—steam boats and stages. There have been added to the Lord, upon the good confession, during the summer, in the counties of Lafayette, Clay, and Jackson, fifty or sixty. If we had efficient laborers, many more might be added to the Lord. The harvest is ripe, but the laborers are few.

LEVI VANCAMP.

CICERO, N. Y. February 5, 1837.

Brother Bartlett expects to remove to Pompey: the congregation at that place are very anxious to have him reside among them: they are taking measures to erect a meeting-house next summer.

We greatly need some able brethren to labor in this state; men whose talents and standing will gain them a hearing, and who should go from place to place wherever they could get a hearing, and then labor continually as long as there was a prospect of converting men to the gospel. If this could be done, I have no doubt but the cause would receive an impulse lasting in its consequences. H. JOSLIN.

GREEN PLAIN, Hancock county, Ill. February 3, 1837.

We have formed a church in this place about two years ago, on the scriptures alone, composed of ten or twelve members. We have now increased to twenty-nine. We have two among us who speak in public. We have chosen our officers, such as Elders, and one Deacon.

SAMUEL KNOX.

ST. JOHNS, N. B. December 22, 1836.

I have spent the season in this city. Our success has not been great: we have, however, received ten, six of whom were men in the meridian of life. We number now between 30 and 40, and have our chapel so far completed as to be able to worship in it this winter, and are endeavoring to continue in the Apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, &c. I am fully persuaded that should some good, warm-hearted young man, *well acquainted with the Good Book*, take a stand here, he would reap a rich harvest. Is it not possible to induce some such individual to leave the Western country and visit these dominions? We

Digitized by Google

have a field in this city alone. Commercial cities are generally ungodly ones—it is the case with ours. We need a faithful warm-hearted proclaimer. The city contains about 20,000 inhabitants—about one-third Catholics; the other two-thirds are sorted out as follows: (in the city and adjoining villages of Portland and Carlton, which are included in the above estimate,) 3 Presbyterian, 4 Church of England, two or three Methodists, and one small Baptist church.

W. W. EATON.

[*More than fifty persons were lately added to the church in Sycamore street, Cincinnati. Of these, forty were immersed during Mr. Campbell's stay in the city after the discussion on the Roman Catholic religion.*]

R. R.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE.

I HAVE just arrived at home (March 10th) and find on my desk, as claiming some notice, the November, December, and January numbers of the Apostolic Advocate. I have hastily read such parts of these three numbers as pertain to myself. The first impression may not always be the best, yet persons are apt to utter it, and others are curious to know it. Well, then, it was this:—If, in the judgment of my brethren of Eastern Virginia, I merit such treatment, they certainly have mistaken me, or I have mistaken them; and it is time we understood one another better. The articles themselves as respects their author, in my judgment at least, command my silence. I have no power to stoop to that style of scurrility and abuse which would bring me to the level of those pieces. Having failed to convince my friend, the editor, that I had no motive, that I could have no motive whatever but his own honor—his usefulness and happiness, in every notice that I took of his speculations, farther effort on my part would, I doubt not, be equally unsuccessful. If my efforts to reclaim him from a career of speculation which I clearly foresaw would terminate in nullifying his usefulness to that cause which I plead, have been so perverted and misrepresented as to awaken sympathy in his favor; as though I had made him a mark at which to aim a single shaft from jealousy, envy, or any sinister passion: then, indeed it becomes me silently to wait that day when my motives will be appreciated and my course vindicated either by the result of the experiment in process, or by the Judge of all secrets and of all hearts.

On the subject of re-baptism and of the intermediate state I touched with all gentleness; always leaving the door open before and behind me for my friend to relieve himself from all that I intimated or alleged. But this it appears was not what he desired. I am glad to learn, however, from many regions (I believe from every region, except in the direction of his immediate location) that my motives and arguments have been duly appreciated, and the cause of the ancient faith, piety, and morality relieved from those crude notions of the Christian institution, and those wild and untaught speculations which all men of understanding have been pleased to call Materialism. The speculative part of these essays has always been with me, and certainly now is, the most innocent part of the affair, compared with the TONE, and TEMPER, and MANNER of their author; and his effort, by publishing extracts from private letters and misrepresenting my feelings, sayings, motives, and intentions, to alarm the jealousies, and to enlist in his favor the warm sympathies of my long and highly esteemed brethren of Eastern Virginia. Alas, that a feeling in itself so honorable to them, and so characteristic of an ardent and zealous temperament, should ever be excited by false insinuations, and unjust suspicions!

I endeavored both in Philadelphia and in Richmond, by my private letters to the brethren, and my public notices, to bring the Doctor forward; to hold up his hands, to strengthen his efforts, and to palliate his imprudencies, as in my letters to Elder Jones, in the hope that he would use his influence in behalf of the faith, and worship, and spirit of the primitive church. But how that influence has been employed the brethren in those cities can fully attest. And those very acts of kindness are now made the means of an acrimonious abuse; and I am compelled to reason, that, if, in despite of all these efforts on my part, my early hints, and my latter more formal remonstrances and expostulations must be met in the spirit, and letter of these three numbers; if he can persuade himself, or any one else, that all this is acceptable to the Lord, or that I wish to domineer over him or them; then have I lived in vain, and labored in vain towards him and them. It is therefore time to desist from efforts which by some evil presiding genius are always perverted into a directly opposite signification, and which only furnish exultation to the enemies of reform, and create rival and sinister feelings among brethren. Perhaps a year or two of profound

Digitized by Google

silence on my part, as respects any thing the Doctor may say, or write, or do, will be most acceptable to him, and most beneficial to those, if any there be, who have been converted to the theories, and notions, and views of the Advocate. This single notice, indeed, may serve for a standing text for a year, according to the fecundity of the last year's Advocate. If it do, then, we can only add to our silence in a corresponding ratio.

I am, I confess, fairly vanquished—not indeed by the argument, but by the tone, and spirit, and style of these last numbers; and till a better understaindg and a radical change of spirit appear on the part of the Apostolic Advocate, I bid him a benevolent adieu

March 11, 1837. A. C.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The question asked by "Gustavus" is untaught.

Various communications and queries on file will be attended to in our next.

ERRATA.

Page 106, read, *Professor Biggs*, for "Mr. Hite," 20th line from bottom. NINE for "eight," second line from top.

POETRY.

FROM THE LONDON LITERARY GAZETTE.

FIRST AND LAST HOURS.

Lov'st thou the hour, the first of day,
When the dewy flowers are opening bright,
When through the curtains of morning gray
Are stealing streaks of crimson light?
Hath it not a power, a spell?
Doth it not to thy warm heart tell
Of life, fresh, sparkling, new-born life,
And scenes as yet too young for strife?

Lov'st thou the hour in twilight time,
When every flower is closing round;
When fainter and fainter the far bell's chime
Comes with a soothing, dying sound?
Hath it not a spell, though it be
Differing from the first, for thee?
Doth it not tell of visions deep,
And a gradual dropping down to sleep?

These hours are types and signs of thine:
Thy first hour brought both smiles and tears,
And call'd forth feelings half divine,
In those who look'd to future years,
And watch'd how grew each feature's mould,
And saw their little buds unfold,
And trusted strife should never come,
To cast on heart and brow a gloom.

And thy last hour—'tis thine to make
It calm as twilight's lovely time,
A blessed sleep, from which to wake,
Will be to the better world to climb:
Remember 'tis thine, ay, thine, to choose
If storms shall take place of stars and dews,
Or if thy spirit shall have a power
To make its parting like day's last hour.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER IV.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *April*, 1837.

REFORMERS *NOT* SCHISMATICS;

OR,

"THE BAPTIST REGISTER" AND THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.

WE embrace the earliest opportunity of returning our thanks to friend Beebee, editor of the New York *Baptist Register*, for an unexpected act of justice bestowed on us of the *Harbinger*, in his paper of the 3d February, in permitting us to repudiate the foul allegations of the *Baptist Banner*, of Shelbyville, Ky., touching our faith in the divine person and mission of the Lord Messiah. We translate the whole article to our pages for the purpose of disabusing our Baptist friends of some errors prejudicial to the cause of truth, and injurious to themselves as a denomination.

"MR. A. CAMPBELL.—We some time since published an extract from the Baptist Banner, in regard to Mr. Campbell's new translation of the New Testament, in which the orthodoxy of his sentiments on the Trinity were questioned. In his reply he utterly repudiates the charge of Unitarianism, with a sharp rap on brother Waller and ourselves for our ignorance. We cheerfully publish this notice of Mr. C's contradiction, and would append his own article if we could lay our hand on it, but the last Harbinger has been accidentally mislaid. We would not designedly misstate the creed of the gentleman, or any other man, though we honestly think Mr. C. has made a vast deal of trouble in Zion, quite unnecessarily. If he should sit down seriously, and take a candid survey of his course for several years back, he would, we think, see much to give him sorrow in the retrospect. He has, indeed, produced much schism; but where is the reform? Is it in the abolishment of written creeds?—as though there was nothing definitely furnished in the scriptures as a matter of faith; and if so, it was utterly wrong to express it in writing—and the record must be exterminated, even at the peril of Zion's peace! What justifiable reason for quarrel is it, that one says he fully believes in the Bible, and hesitates about subscribing a creed,—and another says, Here are my sentiments, on this paper, which compose the summary of my belief, as furnished in the Bible,—when both are worthy and excellent brethren? None. Yet Mr. C. has stirred up great strife on this subject, and separated many friends; but where is the reform? Is it in the abolishment of textuary preaching?

Digitized by Google

A great noise was made by Mr. C. against preaching from a single verse, or parts of verses, of scripture, at one time; as though it made any difference whether a minister or brother spoke from one, or twenty, or fifty, so he spoke "according to the oracles of God." "If any man speak," says the Apostle. "let him speak as the oracles of God;" and expository preaching is no better than textuary preaching, if it be not according to the sacred oracles. Does Alexander Campbell never address assemblies from one or two passages of scripture? We have no doubt he does.

"But where is the reform? Is it in ministers receiving no compensation while they are preaching the gospel? A great deal has been said by Mr. C. against hireling preachers, if we mistake not; and if we mistake not, Mr. C. has given a strong hint in justification of a support being given them, by the publication of his Welsh anecdote; and also by the proceedings of his "co-operation meetings." But where is the reform? we again ask. Is it in the improved morality of those who have seceded from the regular churches, or in their improved harmony and order? Let Dr. Thomas, of Virginia, and Mr. Alexander Campbell himself, answer this question. To Mr. C. we award the credit of superior talents and learning, which, if they had been wisely used, would have been a rich blessing to Zion and the world; but which have been unhappily employed in the promotion of schisms and sorrows, instead of any important reform. We have other questions to ask about his reform, which we may do at another time."

Though not smooth in poetry, yet there is much philosophy and reproof in the proverbial couplet, which, not in terms inapposite to the present case, thus speaks—

> "Forgiveness to the injur'd does belong;
> But he ne'er pardons who has done the wrong."

That we are much more 'sinned against than sinning,' in this charge of schism; or, that we are perfectly innocent of this offence against Protestant Christendom, can be shown to the entire satisfaction of every candid and intelligent person who will lend an ear to our defence. That we have been *separated* rather than *separatists*, is, if our history was truly written, as susceptible of proof as any historic fact of the last three centuries.

So fully were we aware of the evils of schism, and so reluctant to assume the attitude of a new party, that we proposed to continue in the Presbyterian connexion, even after we were convinced of various imperfections in the form of its government, in its system of discipline, in its administration of Christian ordinances, and of the want of scriptural warrant for infant baptism; provided only, they would allow us to follow out our convictions by not obliging us to do what we could not approve, and allowing us to teach and enforce only those matters for which we could produce clear scriptural authority, and make all the rest a subject of forbearance till farther enlightened.

In the second place, when it became necessary, because of the refusal of our Pedobaptist friends to permit this, and more especially because of our actual renunciation of infant baptism, to be separated from our former religious connexions, although we had then a very humble opinion of the intelligence and piety of the Baptist society of Western Pennsylvania and Virginia, we were willing to unite with them rather

Digitized by Google

than form a new party; and did accordingly make to them a proposition to that effect. In our overtures to the Baptists we fully and faithfully gave them in writing an explicit statement of the points in which we concurred with them, and of the points in which we differed, asserting our willingness to co-operate with them on the principle of mutual forbearance on all matters of opinion, and of united action in all matters of faith, piety, and morality. They covenanted to form such a union, and in good faith of this agreement we entered into it September, 1813. On the Bible, as our only rule of faith, piety, and morality, we solemnly covenanted, as the Records of the Redstone Baptist Association will show.

In process of time difficulties arose, rather about human traditions and opinions, than about any thing in the Bible. On the gospel facts—on the divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—on the nature of the sacrifice of Christ as a true and proper sin-offering—on the reconciliation to God through faith in that sacrifice—of the consequent effects of that faith in all acts of Christian obedience—of the nature of Christ's kingdom and the new birth, we had no controversy. No one of those dogmas or doctrines usually styled *evangelical* or *cardinal* amongst Protestants, ever was debated during our continuance in that connexion. The studying of the Bible; the necessity of an attentive, diligent, and constant reading of that book, as a means of sanctification; the proper distribution of it into the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Gospel times; the simplicity of the Christian Institution; the obligation of keeping ourselves separate from the world; of keeping all the ordinances as delivered to us; of unreserved submission to the Lord; of elevating the standard of a Christian spirit, and of Christian character, were the burthen of our ministrations in those days. The particular societies which we erected met every Lord's day, celebrated both the death and resurrection of our Lord, and had their own peculiar arrangements. The other churches knew our order: we knew theirs. They did not seek to impose their rules upon us, nor did we think of making our order obligatory on them. We plead free discussion, interchange of sentiment and communion, and only asked in return that measure of liberality and candor which we had measured to them. Thus things progressed for some years, till envy, jealousy, and pride began to work in some bosoms; and these passions, rather than erroneous or false doctrines, dissociated us. They indeed made a sermon I delivered on the Law as distinct from the gospel, at the Association of 1816, the bone of contention. They are dead who were prime operators in this affair, and therefore I pass on.

We withdrew from the Association in Pennsylvania, and united with

Digitized by Google

the Mahoning in Ohio. This was done to avoid division—to prevent schism. That whole Association reformed, and many new converts were added to it. Envy again appeared from another quarter. An anathema from the Beaver Association of Pennsylvania led the van, because we travelled faster than they, or could not pronounce *Shibboleth* as broad and as long as they. It spread from Association to Association, from State to State; and so division and schism became the order of the day. A few demagogues managed the whole concern. The myriads knew nothing but to obey the signal; and then indeed to justify this course we became all of a sudden 'damnably heterodox.' New errors were invented, new controversies were got up, and we daily became more and more *heretical*. Extremes are wont to beget extremes on all subjects, and no doubt both parties in the heat of conflicting opinions frequently said what they ought not, as well as omitted what they ought to have done. The multitnde, however, were no judges of such questions; but they could believe those whom they regarded as '*spiritual men*,' as '*sound in the faith*,' while they alleged what soul-destroying errors we held and taught. We were Arians; we were Unitarians; we were Arminians; we were Universalists; we would soon be Deists; we would finally be Atheists!! We denied a change of heart; the operations of the Spirit; the new birth; made a Saviour of baptism; were exceedingly lax in discipline, &c. &c. It was dangerous to hear us preach; and to read our writings deserved excommunication. The favorite texts were, 'Mark them which cause divisions and offences, and avoid them:' 'A man that is a heretic reject.'

So far as we could be heard or read, and no farther, could we stem this current. After this feverish excitement or frenzy began to abate, the more contemplative and inquisitive began to ask, What *do* they teach? What *do* they believe? This always, or almost always, ended in the full conviction that we were most grievously misrepresented, and that we had neither said nor done any thing worthy of death or of bonds. But unfortunately we had appealed to Cesar; and they had said, *To Cesar you shall go;* and, therefore, they could not, and to this day they cannot say we treated you exceedingly ill, and are willing to make reparation.

In proof that we are not so unpardonably heterodox, I might by the way appeal to every Baptist preacher of intelligence and reputation, that either heard me teach in public or conversed with me on my last Summer tour through my friend Beebee's own state, or from Buffaloe to the city of Boston.

But now our friends, after throwing all the influence which they could command into the scale against us, gravely ask, In what have you re-

Digitized by Google

formed! After crying out, Don't hear them, don't read them, don't believe them; after the long cry of *heresy*, they kindly ask, Well, what have you done? Why make all this disturbance? Wherein do you excel? Is this your boasted reformation? I should, however, be pleased to compare notes, and the present history and state of the Baptist society and other societies around us, with their states and standing when we first said Reform! We have much to say on this subject whenever our brethren are seriously disposed to canvass this matter with that sincerity and gravity which it demands. Meanwhile, though it may appear invidious were I to institute such a comparison, I would say as I said to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cincinnati when he asked with regard to Protestants where they had reformed; 'Sir,' said I, 'when I wish to compare Protestants and Roman Catholics in those respects of which you speak, I do not compare Protestants with the Romanists which live among them, and have been in part enlightened or reformed by them; but when I draw the invidious comparison which you institute, I select a society of pure and unmixed Catholics in New Spain or Old Spain, and along side of these I place a congregation of American Protestants.'

Still, while I honestly think and say that the Baptists ought never to have become schismatical and forced divisions, but ought rather to have tolerated reform and met us with the liberallty and cordiality which we always have shown to them, I would not be understood as undervaluing a single item in our proposed reformation, nor as intimating that they have not in their various systems a mass of human traditions and speculations greatly detrimental to the truth and to the prosperity and triumph of the gospel. They have reformed much in some regions, and much do they still need to reform before they stand perfect and complete in all the revealed will of God. That we were always willing to bear with them, and that we have forborne, is evident from all that has been written on the subject, and from one single fact—viz. that in no instance has a majority in any of our churches ever cast out a minority of Baptists for any difference of opinion. But how often their majorities have cast out our minorities during the last ten years it would pain me to record. Yet we are schismatical! Is the *separatist* or the *separated* the *schismatic?* This is a new question, perhaps, to a million. It were well it was decided. If a brother says you shall neither think nor speak differently from me; and thus compels me to surrender my independence or to withdraw from him, is he or I the schismatic? This is our case. When there is 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one Spirit, one hope, and one God and Father of all,' acknowledged, as by the Baptists and by us, I would bear a great many frailties and errors in

Digitized by Google

judgment on the part of my brethren rather than separate from them. But the instant they say to me, You must not think, nor speak, nor teach differently from me, that moment I must withdraw from them; not because of what the opinion, or thought, or word, or action may be, on account of which we differ; but because of an attempt to divest me of my personal freedom, and dignity, and independence, which, as the Lord's freeman, I never can surrender.

That there is need of reformation (and it is generally both safe, and profitable, and honorable to be on the side of reformation) is confessed by all intelligent and good men among our Baptist brethren; and that we have attempted it, is, in our estimation, no dishonor, and I am sure we will never repent it; but I am not so certain that they will not one day have to blush for having withstood our efforts and decried our endeavors to introduce a better order of things. One thing is already obvious to many of them, that they might have been within ten years last past a hundred thousand stronger than they now are, and as orthodox too, had they had a little more humility and a little more of that wisdom 'which is first pure, and then peaceable; gentle, and easy to be persuaded; full of mercy and of good fruits; without partiality, and without hypocrisy.'

I am, however, pleased to see among the most enlightened classes of our Baptist brethren and other societies for whom we entertain a very high respect, a growing candor and willingness to examine the ground on which we are standing; and may I add, that we are not without many flattering testimonies from even our Pedobaptist friends, that the cardinal principles for which we plead are gaining every day on the good sense of the best educated classes in all Christian communities.

Our friend Beebee asks a few questions about creeds, textuary preaching, ministers receiving no compensation, and the tendency of reform in the promotion of harmony and superior morals, as tests of the reformation which we plead. I thank him for so few exceptions to our course. It is a good omen. Let me then say for his encouragement to go on to inquire still farther, that, for not one of these things, nor for all of them combined, did we suffer excision. They might have retained their written creed of opinions if they would not have forced it upon us, or made it a term of communion. They might have taken as many texts as they preached sermons. They might have paid as much money as they pleased to their evangelists and elders, (a sin, however, of which I never thought the Baptists excessively guilty, and I am sure I never accused them of excessive liberality,) and they might have employed ten times as many of them; and for these causes I never would have suffered excision. Nor would the fact that there are persons among them

Digitized by Google

of the spirit and stamp of Dr. Thomas, or that there was not perfect harmony in all their views or actions, have constrained my opposition to them as a community. The four points of reform of which the gentleman ironically speaks, are then mere fractions, which, when all added together, in my estimation do not make one whole number in the great points of scripture doctrine and scriptural reformation for which a few leaders, most of whom have passed the Jordan, compelled the anathemas of churches against us, that to this moment are perfectly ignorant of the whole matter of our views and teaching.

The morality point indeed is a radical one, but that belongs to the individuals rather than to the system. That we have induced multitudes to reform in their morals, I presume the gentleman will not deny; and that the Baptists, like Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, have preached reformation of manners, and effected it in many cases, I am pleased to acknowledge. On this point there is no controversy.

If, then, our friend Mr. Beebee will faithfully present these matters to his readers, he may perhaps undeceive some of them, and prepare the way for a better understanding and a more cordial co-operation in all the great matters of the common salvation. We shall then discover who is in truth schismatical. A. C.

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 105.]

THE DIALOGUE.

I PERCEIVE, added I, that the Christians of these days persevere in earnest prayer until their requests are granted.*

"Yes," said my companion, "or until they learn that their wishes are incompatible with the Divine purposes.† In seasons of affliction, whether public or private, and in performing some of the solemn duties of their religion, they are wont also to continue long in fasting as well as prayer."‡

And pray how do they fast? Do they eschew all flesh except that of fishes§ upon Friday? Or do they fast from sin four times a-year upon a Thursday when preparing for the sacrament?

"Ah!" returned he, "they are a people redeemed from all iniquity,‖ who are every day equally intent upon keeping them-

* Luke xviii. 1—8 † 2 Cor xii. 8, 9. ‡ Luke v. 35: Acts xiii. 2, 3: 2 Cor. xi. 27. § Paul says there is a "flesh of fishes," 1 Cor. xv. 39. ‖ 1 Cor. vi. 11: Eph. v. 27: Titus ii. 14.

Digitized by Google

selves from evil—unspotted by the world. To this end, they continue steadfastly to hear the teaching of the Apostles, to watch and pray, and to commemorate upon the first day of the week the death and resurrection of their Lord.* Their fasting consists in a total abstinence from food and drink,† by which they acquire a perfect control over their natural appetites, and enjoy a more exalted communion with the Divine Being. Those who can thus command lawful desires, you may judge are in little danger of being overcome by unlawful ones. But the meeting has dispersed to spread the joyful intelligence of Peter's release. That middle-aged man who is still in sight, and who has just overtaken the tall young man with whom he is in company, is Cleopas. As we will not be observed, we will approach and hear their conversation."

Descending again into the street, we soon overtook Cleopas and his companion between whom the following dialogue occurred:—

Cleopas. My dear Agenor, my heart is transported with joy. O! that you were enabled to share our happiness; and that the Lord who has delivered our beloved Peter from prison, would release your mind from the fetters which education has imposed upon it!

Agenor. I am sensibly affected by the interest you take in my welfare; and your kindness in receiving my sick brother and myself into your house, when perfect strangers, and the many attentions you have bestowed upon us in the midst of your own dangers and trials, have bestowed obligations never to be forgotten.

While I remained with my parents in the beautiful isle of Cyprus,‡ my native country, they sought to impress upon my youthful mind the necessity of piety towards the gods, and a deep reverence for the religious customs, and opinions of my countrymen. "It is our charming isle," they were wont to say, "which has been specially favored by the deities, and is honored by the whole of Greece for having been the abode of Venus, to whom it

---

* Acts ii. 42; xx. 7. † The import of the term, fasting, is forever settled by Luke v. 33. "Why do the disciples of John *fast* often—but thine *eat and drink*?" Here fasting is set in direct contrast or opposition to eating and drinking. To fast, therefore, is simply not to eat or drink. ‡ CYPRUS signifies *fair* or *happy*

Digitized by Google

is forever consecrated. It was to these happy shores, that, when produced from the froth of the sea,* she was wafted by Zephyrus in a cradle formed of a shell. It was here that the Hours received and nurtured her until she was presented to the gods; and it was in these ever-blooming bowers and sacred groves that she resorted in company with the Graces, crowned with roses, and followed by the beautiful Adonis. She is our tutelar deity; her temples are perfumed with incense, and youths and maidens place offerings of fruits and flowers upon her unstained altars." But I confess to you that since my brief acquaintance with the disciples of Jesus, I have been presented with a purity of thought and behaviour; a depth of holy affection, benevolence, and love; an elevation of wisdom and of hope, and a contempt of death, which, contrasted with the degrading vices, fears, and ignorance of the Cyprians, has filled me with admiration. Some wonderful things, too, which you have related to me concerning Christ, and the strange event of to-night have inspired me with a desire to know more of these things. You have spoken of the miraculous power which Christ possessed, and have urged this as one of the proofs of his Divine mission. Will you oblige me by relating some of the miracles which he performed.

Cleopas. You have assigned to me a most agreeable task. Know, then, that our Lord wrought many signs and wonders, and healed the sick, the lame, and the blind throughout the land of Israel. He opened the ears of the deaf, cast out demons, and even raised the dead to life by a word, as I have myself witnessed, and multitudes now alive can testify. And these works prove that he was sent by the Father.† This was the primary reason or original object of his miracles. For this wonderful power over the winds and waves and all created things, must come from God the maker of the heavens and the earth, who alone can exercise it or give it unto men.

It is, however, in the secondary reasons of our Lord's miracles, or, in other words, in the motives which induced him to exert his power, that his character is so well displayed. Miraculous power would have been equally evident if it had been exerted only upon insensible objects, as the waters, and the

* She was hence called Aphrodite—from *aphros*, froth. † John v. 36; x. 37.

Digitized by Google

earth, or in giving a sign in the sky which the Jews once earnestly desired. But this would have been a display of power merely, whereas our Lord by exerting it in behalf of the afflicted, and in healing all manner of sickness and disease among the people, has exhibited that goodness and love which induced him not only thus to bear our infirmities and our sicknesses,* but finally our sins in his own body on the tree. Oh! had you witnessed the benignity and pity which dwelt upon his countenance, when he fed, in the desert, with a few loaves and fishes, the fainting multitudes! Or when, entering the city of Nain and seeing the grief of the widow whose only son they were bearing to the tomb, he touched the bier, and raised the dead to life! Or when, moved by the sorrows of those he loved, he wept at the tomb of Lazarus, and bade him come forth, though he had already been interred four days! All these and many other miracles which I could relate to you, were wrought by our Lord from the principle or feeling of *compassion*.†

Agenor. His power, then, was not exerted indifferently upon all, but was called forth by peculiar circumstances and motives? I can easily perceive that the selection of deserving objects, and the relieving the unhappy, displayed not power only, but benevolence also, and my heart acknowledges the influence of this attribute in the character of Christ. But what was the reason of the miraculous draught of fishes of which I have heard?

Cleopas. Ah! it grieves me to think of the weakness of our faith—the want of confidence which we so often showed! You must know, however, that when Jesus first called his disciples from the various avocations by which they were previously supported, they were at times involved in no little perplexity and doubt as to the means of sustenance, and could illy bear the hunger and thirst and the various privations which Jesus endured with so much fortitude.‡ We had formed also very imperfect views of the nature of the Messiah's kingdom. We thought it was of this world, ignorant that we were, and that he would redeem Israel from all oppressors, and reinstate our nation in its former grandeur.§ Yea, I was myself a simpleton and slow of

* Isaiah liii. 4: Matth. viii. 17. † Matth. xiv. 14; xv. 32; xx. 34: Luke vii. 13: John xi. 33, 35. ‡ Matth. viii. 20; x. 9, 10, 38; xii. 1; xiv. 15, 16, 17; xvi. 8; xix. 21: Luke xii. 32, 33: John iv. 8, 31—34; vi. 66. § Matth. xx. 20, 21: Luke xxii. 29: Acts i. 6.

Digitized by Google

heart to believe all that the Prophets had written, until three days after his crucifixion, when on the road to Emmaus with one of the brethren, he joined us, under the form of a stranger, and affected to inquire the reason of the grief which overwhelmed us. It was then, in a heavenly conversation, at the remembrance of which my bosom thrills, we first learned that the Messiah ought thus to have suffered and entered into his glory![*] From these and other circumstances it was, that some showed at times a disposition to forsake Jesus and return again to the business which they had pursued. It was so with our beloved Peter, who had a family to support. For although he was received as a disciple, and honored with a new name on the second day after our Lord was baptized,[†] and was subsequently a witness of his miraculous power when he cured his wife's mother of a fever,[‡] yet he with Andrew his brother[§] and James and John his partners returned to their occupation of fishing.[‖] While they were engaged in washing their nets,[¶] Jesus came down to the sea of Galilee, and being thronged by the people who pressed forward to hear the word of God—those heavenly instructions which our brethren seemed to have forsaken, he entered into Simon's boat, and, pushing a little from shore, taught the people from thence. After he had concluded, he bade Simon to launch out into the deep and let down his nets for a draught. Now Simon's fishing had proved wholly unsuccessful, and being weary and disappointed, he informed the Lord that he had already tried in vain. But, awed by that voice of inexpressible majesty which could still the raging waves, change the purposes of enemies,[**] and upon whose accents admiring throngs were wont to hang with rapture, he consented to make the experiment. Judge, then, his surprise, when they enclosed such a multitude of fishes that the net began to break, and calling upon James and John, who were in another boat, for aid, they filled both barks until they were in danger of sinking! The meaning of the miracle flashed at once upon Peter's mind. They had toiled all night and caught nothing! The Lord wished them to feel their dependence upon him, and to show them that while even their ordinary pursuits would be un-

[*] Luke xxiv. 13—32: Mark x. 37, 38: Matth. xvi. 21—25. [†] Compare John i. 29. 35. 39, 42. [‡] Luke iv. 38, 39. [§] Mark i, 16. [‖] Compare Luke iv. 38; v. 3; and John i. 42. [¶] Luke v. 2. [**] John vii. 46.

Digitized by Google

successful without his blessing, they needed not any longer to doubt his ability to provide for and sustain them. Overwhelmed with alarm and contrition for his fault, Simon exclaimed, "Depart from me, O Lord, for I am a sinful man!" But Jesus said to him, "Fear not;" and, as his manner was to improve every incident for a spiritual purpose, he added, "From henceforth thou shalt catch men." I need scarcely add that from this moment they forsook their boats, their nets, their relatives, and every thing which they possessed, to follow Christ.*

Agenor. This was truly an astonishing miracle, and an ingenious reproof. But, tell me, was the lesson ever forgotten?

Cleopas. Alas! we are prone to forgetfulness, and Jesus had occasion more than once to reprimand our anxiety and want of confidence.† Nay, you will be suprised to hear, that, during the interval between our Lord's resurrection and his ascension to heaven, when we no longer enjoyed his constant company and presence, and indeed had seen him only twice since he was raised from the dead,‡ Peter, through the force of habit and the apparent uncertainty of his situation, was again induced to resort to his old occupation. He had no sooner mentioned his design, than James and John, his old companions, and some others declared they would accompany him.§ On this occasion, they again toiled all night and caught nothing! And behold, in the morning, a voice from the shore, from which they were distant about two hundred cubits, bade them cast their nets upon the right side of the vessel. They obeyed, and now were unable to draw it for the multitude of fishes! The memory of the past rushes across their minds. John exclaims to Peter, "It is the Lord!" and he with that energy and decision which mark his character, and in which he is so superior to us all, leaps into the sea! He swims to the shore, and there discovers a fire burning, and not only fish laid thereon, but bread also! At the command of Jesus they bring the net to land containing a hundred and fifty-three large fishes, and yet its meshes were unbroken! He invites them to dine! They obey, and you may guess their feelings, for they knew that it was the Lord, and none of them durst ask him Who art thou? It was then, after they had dined,

* Luke v. 1—11; xiv. 33; xviii. 28. † Luke xii. 29: Matth. xvi. 8—10.
‡ John xxi. 14. § John xxi. 3.

Digitized by Google

that he so pointedly reproved Peter for neglecting his spiritual improvement and that of his brethren, by asking three different times in the most emphatic manner, and pointing to the nets and implements which denoted his calling, "Lovest thou me more than these?" and upon Peter's answering each time in the affirmative, commanding him three times to employ himself in those spiritual concerns which were entrusted to his care.

Such were the circumstances which elicited these displays of miraculous power. Such also were the means employed by our blessed Lord to confirm our wavering faith, and correct the weaknesses of those he has so dearly loved and so highly honored.

Agenor. You greatly increase my admiration for the character of Jesus. How pointed, and yet how affectionate was his question to Peter! And how forcible its repetition! But you mentioned to me yesterday another remarkable miracle—his walking upon the boisterous waves of the sea. Can you explain the secondary or immediate reasons for this manifestation of power? Was it merely to display power, or what was its object? Why did he not go in the ship with the disciples? L.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. III.*

This is the victory that conquers the world—our faith. Who is he that conquers the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Christ?

John the Apostle.

AMONGST that class of licensed murderers, called *heroes*, but one is said to have conquered the world. That world, however, which he conquered, finally conquered him; for his conquest was but the momentary triumph of one ambitious spirit over other ambitious spirits, equally daring, but less fortunate than himself. Like a splendid meteor, thundering as it shines, his noisy flight, though brilliant, was short and soon past; and to the midnight revel the victor becomes a victim and vanishes from the wonder, rather than the admiration of human-kind. The Mace-

Digitized by Google

donian Chief, though often the derision of the sage and the grave moralist, is fortunately enshrined amongst the most instructive monuments of the weakness of earth's proudest conquerors in the appalling conflict between reason and passion; or rather, as in this case, between the love of glory and the love of wine.

In the proper sense of the term, *the world*, however, as indicative of all those artificial creations, the root and offspring of human passion and appetite; or, as defined by an inspired writer, the compound of "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, which is not of the Father, but of the world;" I say *the world*, in its biblical import, never was vanquished by any person destitute of the faith of God's elect. On the contrary, all unbelieving men are overcome by it. In some of its ten thousand forms it lays wait for them; and, adapted as it is, to all the corrupt and selfish workings of the human heart, it finds in every human being a sympathy with it, or a taste for it, in some of those respects in which it opposes God, and Christ, and heaven; and thus by its allurements and fascinations all are captivated who are not of the faith, or amongst the expectants of another and a better world, suited to beings of a more elevated character—of a purer and holier order.

All, indeed, are not subdued by the same arguments or adaptations. All are not the victims of ambition, the devotees of avarice, the sons and daughters of gaiety and pleasure. Nor are the immense groups that worship in any of these temples of one general or catholic communion. Amongst the ambitious there are perhaps a thousand sects. There are those ambitious of ecclesiastic as well as political honors; and of ecclesiastic honors of every description; ambitious of the honors of a Churchman or a Dissenter; of a Calvinist or an Arminian; of a Baptist or a Pedobaptist—an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian—an Erastian or an Independent.

Of political honors there are as many castes as there are kinds of human government, and officers and grades in those governments. Here the proud autocrat disdains the limited monarch, and there the supercilious aristocrat is contemned by the more humble democrat. The ambition of every aspirant after political, literary, or ecclesiastic honors is not placed on the

Digitized by Google

same object, nor gratified with the same eminence. Here a Curate's charge, and there a Bishop's diocess; here a Cardinal's cap and there a Pope's mitre, fill the horizon of certain individuals, as fully as the magistracy of a county, or the presidency of a state, as the regalia of a nation, or the imperial honors of a continent sate the aspirations of the various incumbents of these particular stations.

Society seems to have cast itself into an endless variety of moulds for the sake of baiting the hook by which to gull the thoughtless multitude of worshippers in the temple of Ambition. The names of places and of offices in the literary, political, and religious world—in the peace and war establishments—the sea and land armies—the occupations, callings, and pursuits honorable, more honorable, most honorable, would fill a dictionary larger than the Bible; and then of the three just mentioned—the ambitious, the avaricious, the voluptuous, but the first would stand in full array before us.

I cannot speak of the slaves of avarice, the sects of philosophy, nor of the mighty hosts whose god is their appetites—whose only end and aim are sensual gratifications of one or more of a thousand varieties. But all these, of each and every class, may be as fully sold to the world, and enslaved by it, as was Alexander, or Cesar, or Hannibal, or Napoleon. Every Mammonite becomes not a Crœsus, a Girard, or a Rothschild; every rhymester becomes not a Pope, a Goldsmith, or a Byron; every orator becomes not a Demosthenes, a Cicero, or a Sheridan; every student becomes not a Bacon, a Locke, or a Newton; nor every voluptuary a Boniface, or a Belshazzar: yet they may be as sincere, ardent, and devoted to this worship as the most successful laborers in their respective avocations; for success is not the fruit of sincerity, else amongst the worshippers of Mammon what multitudes would have been rich who are yet poor!!

But one thing is certain, that "his servants we are whom we obey," and that *every one is conquered by that which controls him;* and, therefore, from the prince to the beggar all may be, and, in many nations and tribes, all are, overcome by the world in some way or other—he only excepted who believes that Jesus is the Christ.

Digitized by Google

And here the question arises, *How does faith conquer the world?* or, What in the belief that Jesus is the Christ is more powerful than the world? To understand this we must first understand the phrase "*course of the world.*" This apostolic phrase denotes that current of earthly affection, lusts, passions, or cares, which carry the soul downwards from the knowledge, love, and admiration of God, which material nature and the daily providences of God would, in subordination to Revelation, but for that current, greatly promote. For I would emphatically say, that universal being, or, as some would express it, universal nature, were it not for this "course of the world," would furnish innumerable arguments and motives to admire, to adore, and delight in the Author of this stupendous and beautiful frame of nature, which seems to us to have no end but the existence and happiness of man.

Such, however, is the power of present objects over the human constitution, for which we have both a natural and acquired taste and appetite, that reason, philosophy, and moral suasion assail it in vain. Under the idolatries and philosophy of the Pagan world, in its best forms, this power was supreme and irresistible. The brightest names of Grecian and Roman fame were subject to the supremacy of this influence; and, therefore, not one of them could stem the current or course of this world, or make a successful effort to overcome it. The secret, then, in pursuit of which we have instituted this inquiry, is, that all systems of human philosophy or wisdom furnished not suitable or competent motives to oppose this current, and to excite and enable men to wage war against so powerful an alliance as the world, the flesh, and Satan.

The strength of every moral system will always be found to consist in the strength of the motives which it offers: for rational beings cannot act without motives; and they must always act in accordance with the strength or force of the motives presented. If, then, there are two classes of motives offered, human nature will always be controlled by the most powerful, according to its own apprehension of them. Men may not, indeed, always perceive the most valuable consideration, and therefore they cannot appreciate the weightier motive: for it is not enough that the object be a superior one, but that the mind perceive it to be such.

Digitized by Google

In the science of motives the perception of the value of an object is essential to its becoming an argument or motive to action: for every thing must act as it is when all circumstances are considered, and therefore if different objects stand before the mind, no matter which of them be intrinsically greatest or best, that which under all circumstances appears to be such, will become a motive to action, and control the percipient to the disparagement of that which may be, in truth, the most valuable, though not so in his estimation.

Our conclusion, then, is, that human nature is so constituted that it must act in unison with that class of objects or motives which appear to be the best and most desirable under all the circumstances of the case. Now as the world, without the knowledge of the gospel, could offer no objects or motives beyond itself, but such as were a part of itself, or of its own nature, it followed that all mankind so placed must be ruled, or led by it, in some one or more of its ten thousand motives suited to the ten thousand varieties of human organization and circumstance. Hence all mankind, without the gospel, are inevitably the slaves of the world and are conquered by it.

But still, although a new world is revealed and a future life discovered by the gospel; if that gospel be not believed, that future world and all its excellencies and charms will be as though it were not; and hence the possibility of still being governed by the world and of being enslaved to it, although life and immortality are brought to light, so long as that gospel is not understood and believed. Hence the necessity of faith. It is in the philosophy of man and of his condition necessary, not as a *quid pro quo*, a valuable condition, but as a means, or rather as the only possible medium, of acquaintance with another class of objects, celestial and divine. And this is the true reason why faith conquers the world; because by it, as through a telescope, a person sees another world so incomparably superior, that, from the moment of its discovery, he lets go his hold on the present, and supremely devotes himself to the future. The new objects are so lovely, excellent, and overwhelming as to control all the objects of time and sense, and to set the mind adrift from the moorings of temporal and perishing things. The Christian then,

Digitized by Google

indeed, acts the philosopher, or, in other words, acts most rationally in "counting all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus the Messiah," and of "treating them as refuse that he may win Christ," and be found in his party in the day of rewards. This explains the conquests of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and all that class in every age who endured all pains and privations—"*as seeing Him who is invisible*"—"*having respect* to the recompense of the reward"—"*looking* not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen"—"*placing their affections* on things above, and not on things on the earth"—"*walking by faith*, and not by sight"—"*anxiously desiring* the coming of the day of the Lord; and "*striving* to be found in him without spot, unrebukable at his appearing and his glory."

We can now explain the whole mystery of these words, "Who is he that overcomes the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Messiah?" because he is the only person who has the distinct vision of another world, so transcendant and so glorious, as to eclipse all the pleasures, honors, and glories of earthly things—of "sceptres, monuments, and crowns;" and which so fully adapts itself to the vastness and grandeur of human aspirations, promising with infallible certainty the full enjoyment of all that human nature in its most cultivated and improved condition can either conceive or desire. The class of objects which the gospel presents to one "led by the Spirit of God," affords motives so much stronger than all earthly objects, that the reason of this victory is as obvious as the reason of any of the effects, physical or moral, of which human science treats.

How great the power of religion, then, when faith alone—the simple belief of the gospel facts, as they are set before us by the demonstrations of the Spirit of God and of almighty power, is more than a match for "all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them"! Superadded to this faith, the love of God shed abroad in the heart, and the living hope of being raised incorruptible, and being forever with the Lord, render exceedingly efficacious the gospel in elevating and adorning human character, and in imparting zeal, courage, fortitude, and devotion to all who clearly understand and cordially embrace it. It is, indeed, "the power of God to salvation" to every one who truly believes it.

Digitized by Google

Christian heroes are, then, the brightest and most illustrious victors in the annals of the world. Through faith in the promises of God, they have "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the strength of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, became valiant in battle, overturned the camps of aliens—women have been tortured not accepting proffered deliverance in the hope of a better resurrection; and others overcame the trials of mocking, scourging, bonds, and imprisonment—of being stoned, sawn asunder, slain by the sword—of going about in sheep-skins and goat-skins—being destitute, afflicted, tormented—wandering in deserts and mountains, hiding themselves in caverns and caves of the earth."

As this picture is by no means an exaggeration, let us compare ourselves, and ask, *What lack I yet?* How few Christians, does any one ask, if such must always be the power of religion? We dare not place its power below what the ancient saints achieved in the faith of the better promises which we enjoy. Its power is certainly greater than all the powers of the present world; for if any one has realized "the powers of the world to come," he is certainly more than a match for all earthly powers than can be arrayed against him.

What then shall we say of those Christian ministers who have left off preaching the gospel for the sake of a more lucrative employment!! This is a question reserved for future and farther discussion; and as the times require, we shall pay this class of victorious Captains of the Christian Army a more respectful attention.

But, nearly akin to it, is another question, which also demands, at the hand of impartial justice, an equally grave consideration. It is simply this: Under what head of the power of religion in overcoming the world, shall we place those Christians, who, while amassing for themselves treasures on earth, are preaching to preachers the necessity of denying themselves, and of making, or of keeping themselves poor, for the kingdom of heaven's sake; that they may cut off occasion of mercenary imputations on the part of worldly Christians, who would rejoice to see all the world converted by a miracle without costing them a

Digitized by Google

penny. I will acknowledge before the world my want of logical discrimination, when any person proves to me that he would lay down his life for Christ or heaven, or that he possesses the faith which conquers the world, who cannot, while he has it in his power, lay down some of the good things of time and sense, either for the sake of the orphan, the widow, or the preacher of the gospel whom the Lord has specially fore-ordained to live by the gospel, temporally, as well as spiritually and eternally.

A. C.

ON READING THE SCRIPTURES.

The following judicious observations on a profitable reading of the Scriptures, are found in Dr. *Thomas Scott's* Essays:—

"WHETHER we consider the scriptures as a revelation which the Lord hath made to us of himself, that we may know, worship, and glorify him; or of his law and government, that we may submit to and obey him, and learn our true condition as sinners; or of his mercy and salvation, that we may find acceptance with him; or of the privileges of his children, in this life and that which is to come: in every view of the subject, the duty of searching them must be manifest. Nor can we neglect it, without avowing that we despise the knowledge of God and heavenly things; that we do not desire to serve our Creator; that we neither value his favor nor fear his frown; or that we can discover the way of peace and happiness without instruction. Nothing, therefore, can be more expressive of our ingratitude, rebellion, and alienation from God, than the general neglect of the Bible, which prevails among those who profess to believe it to be his word.

"Does he then speak from heaven to us sinners about the way of eternal salvation, and shall we refuse to hear his gracious words? Does he give us a book to guide us to happiness in this world, and forever, and shall we not study it? Does he make known to us mortals those glories which angels adore with unceasing rapture, and shall we turn away with contemptuous aversion? Hath he provided for us sinners such a redemption as sinless 'angels desire to look into,' and shall we think 'the subject unworthy of notice?' Who can pretend to justify this conduct? Yet how much more pains do lawyers, physicians, and other students, who desire to excel in their professions, bestow in poring over voluminous authors, than men called Christians do in

Digitized by Google

searching the Scriptures! Yea, how many give a decided preference to amusing and ingenious trifles, or political discussions, not to say publications suited to corrupt their principles and morals, above the sacred word of God! They would be ashamed not to have read some admired or popular author, though the work perhaps be wholly useless, if not worse; yet they remain, year after year, unacquainted with the Holy Scriptures! 'Surely in vain is the word of the Lord given to them; the pen of the scribe is in vain.' * * * * * * * *

"The Apostles and Evangelists always reasoned from, and appealed to, the scriptures of the Old Testament, and supposed the Jews to be acquainted with them; and the penmen of the New assure us, 'These things were written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, we might have life through his name.'

"The case then is plain, that our obligation to search the scriptures is indispensable, and that it is a duty of the greatest importance. Every person who allows them to be the infallible word of God, must be convicted in his own conscience of acting in an unreasonable and criminal manner if he do not diligently study them; and the general neglect of men in this great concern, manifestly proves them not to be fully satisfied that the Bible was given by inspiration from God, and that it reveals the only way of peace and salvation. We do not urge men to believe without evidence; but we call upon them humbly and seriously to examine the proofs afforded them that the scriptures are the word of God; and then to bestow pains to learn the religion contained in them, and to compare the doctrine we propose with that unerring standard from which we profess to have learned it. Nor can we doubt but they who will not comply with such requisitions, will be left without excuse at the day of final retribution, whatever excuses or pretences they may make at present. * * * *

"Every part of the sacred oracles has its use, and throws light upon the rest; and as preachers very properly make their appeal to the scriptures in support of their doctrines; so the hearers cannot well judge how far their arguments are conclusive, unless they have a competent acquaintance with the whole of them. Nor is the Bible so large a book, but that even they who have not much leisure, may, in process of time, get a general knowledge of it in every part, if they bestow a measure of diligence proportioned to the value of the acquisition: and as 'all scripture is given by inspiration from God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works;' so every word demands a measure of our attention.

Digitized by Google

It is, therefore, a very great hindrance to edification, when serious persons rest satisfied with text-books and abstracts from scripture, or with a few favorite passages that are continually resorted to, whilst the rest of God's word is little regarded; and above all, those parts are neglected which teach men the particulars of the Christian temper, and of those duties in which they are most deficient. * * * *

"*Search the scriptures daily.* Divine truth is the food of the soul, which wants its nourishments as often as the body does. That day must have been misspent in which no part of the scriptures has been read or meditated on; we should therefore redeem time from indolence, recreation, useless visits, trifling conversation, and inordinate attention to secular affairs, for this employment: and then no *lawful* business would prevent any one from finding a little leisure morning and evening at least, for reading some portion of the scriptures; which would furnish the mind with subjects for meditation when not necessarily engrossed about other matters, to the exclusion of vain thoughts and polluting imaginations. The more habitual this practice becomes, the greater pleasure will it afford; and even the old Christian will not think that his knowledge renders it superfluous, or seek an excuse for omitting it; but will apply to it, as a healthful person craves and relishes his food. I would especially enforce upon the consciences of the young, not to let any day begin or end without reading carefully a portion of scripture: this will become in a short time a most useful habit; and if they be abridged of a little sleep by this means, their bodies will not be injured, and their minds will be improved by it. It may also be observed, that hearing sermons, reading religious books, or joining in pious discourse, will often mislead and seldom profit those who do not compare the whole with the sacred scriptures, by 'daily searching them to know whether things are so.'

"*Read the scriptures with the express purpose of appropriating the information communicated by it from God to man.* When we have humbly and attentively considered and ascertained the meaning of any proposition [in scripture,] we should implicitly believe it, how contrary soever it may be to our opinion or that of others in reputation for wisdom. We ought to reverence the authority, omniscience, veracity, and faithfulness of the Lord, who speaks to us in his word, not doubting the truth or importance of any of his instructions, but studying the meaning of them in docility and patience. Thus imbibing wisdom and knowledge from their source, through the appointed medium, we shall grow more learned in divine things than any teachers or aged students who lean to their own understandings; even as the bosom-friend of the Prince who learns his secrets from his own

Digitized by Google

lips, will know more of his designs than any conjectural politicians can do, though their sagacity and abilities be far superior to his. * * * * * All men are fallible, and we should call no man Teacher upon earth: it must therefore be proper to compare all their elucidations and inferences with the scriptures themselves. * * * * It may be proper here to caution the reader against *fanciful* interpretations, which surprise and amuse, but mislead men from the practical meaning of scripture; and against those who pretend to *modernize* divine truth, not choosing to 'speak according to the oracles of God,' but as they suppose the Apostles would have done if they had possessed the advantage of modern improvements: a supposition just as wise as to attempt improving the light of the sun by astronomy. In short, every text has its proper meaning as it stands related to the context. * * * *

"Lastly, we should search the scriptures as the navigator consults his chart, and makes his observations, that he may discover where he is, and what course he must steer; or as any one looks into a glass that he may both know what manner of man he is, and learn to adjust what is unbecoming; or as an heir reads his father's Will and the inventory of his effects and estates, that he may know what the inheritance is, and the nature of the tenure by which he must possess it. We should accompany our reading with impartial self-examination, both in respect of knowledge, judgment, dispositions, motives, affections, words and actions, in every particular, at present, and in times past, that we may learn the state and want of our souls; and with self-application, as the persons spoken to, in every instruction, precept, sanction, counsel, warning, invitation, or promise, according to our state, character, conduct, and circumstances; pausing to inquire whether we have understood what we have read, and what we have learned from it; that beseeching the Lord to pardon what is past, and to help us for the future, we may, without delay or reserve, begin to practise what we know. * * * It would be easy to multiply directions; but the scriptures thus studied, 'are able to make us wise unto salvation by faith in Jesus Christ.'

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

"EVERLASTING FATHER."

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the govern- shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."—*Isaiah* ix. 6.

Digitized by Google

We have here in the sublime and glowing language of Isaiah, a prophetic annunication of the Messiah, with an enumeration of those *characters* in which he stands related to mankind. There is much difficulty with many, and perhaps all plain English scholars, in understanding what is meant by the expression, "*everlasting Father.*" That this is a mere name without office or character, is not for a moment to be supposed. Such a thing would be an anomaly in the sacred writings. Our Saviour was to be as really what he is here "*called,*" as he was "Saviour," when the angel announced to Mary; "Thou shalt *call* his name JESUS [Saviour,] for he shall save his people from their sins."

The verse is rendered by Noyes* from the Hebrew, as follows:—

> "For to us a child is born,
> To us a son is given,
> And the government shall be upon his shoulder,
> And he shall be called
> Wonderful, Counsellor, mighty Potentate,
> Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."

In part of his note on this verse, he says—"*Everlasting Father*, i. e. perpetual guardian and friend of his people." But all this is still unsatisfactory. Bishop Lowth renders it:—

> "For unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given;
> And the government shall be upon his shoulder:
> And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor,
> The mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age, the Prince of Peace."

This is much more satisfactory and easily understood. Scott in his note here, seems to quote the following from Lowth; "The Septuagint [Greek translation of the Old Testament] renders the words *Pateer mellontos aioonos*, 'The Father of the world to come;' and the vulgate Latin follows this translation; which, since the Hebrew words admit of it, I can't but have a particular regard for, because I am persuaded it is from the authority of this text, that the kingdom of the Messias is called in the New Testament, by the title of *melloon aioon*, '*The age or world to come.*' (*Matt.* xii. 32. *Heb.* ii. 5. vi. 5.' *Lowth.*" Matt. Henry accords with this. "He is *the everlasting Father*, or *the Father of eternity* * * * *the Father of the world to come;* so the LXX [Septuagint] read it; the Father of the Gospel state, which is put into subjection to him, not to the angels, Heb. ii. 6." And Dr. Adam Clarke; "*The everlasting Father*—(Father of the everlasting age—Or [Hebrew] *abi, ad*, the Father of eternity. The *Septuagint* have *megaleys boulees angelos, the Messenger of the Great Counsel.*" Clarke further observes; "He is the *Father of eternity*—the origin of all being, and the cause of

* Translation of the Prophets—generally excellent.

Digitized by Google

the existence, (and particularly the Father) of the spirits of all flesh:" and Scott, "He is also 'the everlasting Father:' 'the second Adam, the Lord from heaven,' 'the everlasting Father' of the whole church, which derives its spiritual being and life from him, as the whole race of men derive their existence from the second Adam. He is 'become to all them that *obey* him, the Author of eternal salvation:'" and Henry; "His fatherly care of his people and tenderness toward them are everlasting. He is the Author of everlasting life and happiness to them, and so is the Father of a blessed eternity to them." All this agrees with what has been previously quoted.

Because the expressions, 'mighty God' and 'everlasting Father,' are not in the Septuagint, some look upon them as an interpolation by the translators of our English Bible. But they forget, or do not know, that the Septuagint is a translation from the Hebrew into the Greek; that the Hebrew is the original language of the Old Testament, and that they are in that. Thomson, in his translation of the Septuagint, renders it; "Because for us a child is born, and to us a son is given, whose government is on his own shoulder; and his name is called, '*The Messenger of great counsel.*' For I will bring peace on the rulers and health for him."

J. R. H.

CONCORD, *Callaway county, Ky.*

Prophetic Department.

THE PROPHECIES—*NO. III.*

WE have taken a miniature view of six remarkable predictions in the book of Genesis. There is yet remaining in this book of twenty-five centuries, another prediction deserving special notice. The prophetic dialect might, perhaps, be somewhat elucidated by a consideration of the dreams of Pharaoh's chief baker and chief butler, as well as by the dreams of the Egyptian monarch under the types of the twice seven kine and ears of corn, by which the approaching fortunes of Egypt and Syria and the circumjacent countries were pictured out; but to expatiate on all these minute points would so retard our progress, as to interpose years of inquiry before we should have all the data requisite to

Digitized by Google

illumine the pages of prophecy yet unfulfilled, and, for the most part, not yet understood. Besides much of the same species of imagery will fall into our path on the investigations of the more general and interesting predictions embracing the destinies of large masses of society.

For this reason, of the twelve prophecies of the Prophet Israel, uttered antecedent to his death, each of which comprehends the destiny of one of his twelve sons in some one or more characteristic attribute, we can only find time to expatiate on that concerning Judah. It is, by all intelligent Christian writers, agreed that the Patriarch uttered the blessings and the curses written concerning his sons by the immediate influence and direction of the spirit of prophecy, and that therefore they are to be regarded as indubitable predictions of their future destiny. It is moreover worthy of remark, that the good and ill fortunes of these twelve tribes seem for the most part to have been occasioned by the good or ill conduct of the founders of each tribe. This is clearly noted in the case of the first three—Reuben, Simeon, and Levi. Reuben, as the first born, might have inherited a double share of the inheritance, the royalty, and the priesthood; but these were taken from him, and given to others, because of the enormity of one of his sins against his father. Simeon and Levi, too, are doomed to a dispersion, and their descendants scattered through all Israel because of their cruelty and violence. But the fortunes of Judah, connected as they are with the whole human race, deserve particular regard. Thus speaks the dying patriarch concerning Judah:—

"Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thine hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion, who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be: binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes. His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk." Gen. xlix. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

Or, according to the Septuagint, it is translated—

"Judas! let thy brethren praise thee;
Thy hands will be on the back of thy enemies;
The sons of thy father shall bow down to thee.
Judas is a lion's whelp:
From a vigorous stem, my son, thou art sprung;
Couching down, thou art gone to sleep

Digitized by Google

Like a young lion: Who dare rouse him!
A chief shall not fail from Judas,
Nor a leader from his loins,
Till the things reserved for him shall come—
Even He, the expectation of nations.
Binding his colt to a vine,
And his ass's colt to the young vine,
He shall wash his robe in wine,
And his mantle in the blood of the grape.
His eyes are more exhilarating than wine,
And his teeth are *whiter* than milk."——*Thomson.*

This benedictory prophecy is amongst the most remarkable of all the ancient predictions, and is certainly the most descriptive and definite of any on record for the first three thousand years of the world; we shall therefore note a few of its prominent points, and in the following order:—

1. Expound certain terms and allusions in the prophecy.
2. Enumerate and state distinctly its grand items—and
3. Adduce such historic facts as prove its full completion.

First, then, as to the terms: *Judah*, the name of the fourth son of Leah, is not only historic, but prophetic. The discriminating student of sacred history will have observed that Leah, his mother, immediately on his birth said, "*Now will I praise the Lord;*" therefore she called his name PRAISE, or *Judah*. The Hebrew word *Yehudah* simply imports *one that acknowledges* or *confesses*. In religious acceptation one who acknowledges a favor with praise or gratitude, is called Yehudah. In the paternal benediction, Jacob, either mindful of what Leah said, or rather in the spirit of prophecy, commencing his future history, says: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall *praise*."

In the second place, a lion's whelp, an old lion, and a nursing lioness, emblems of courage, generosity, strength, and fierceness, are the appropriate images of Judah as distinguished in peace and war. That the tribe of Judah should be magnanimous, rich, warlike, and generally triumphant, is thus clearly indicated.

The third term deserving a remark is *shebet*, rendered *sceptre*. Modern Jews say it simply denotes a *rod* or *staff*, the metaphor of afflictions; and therefore the turn which they now give the passage is, 'Afflictions shall not depart from Judah till Shiloh come.' But this is an interpretation got up for the necessity of

Digitized by Google

the case as it now stands with the Jews. *Onkelos*, the most learned and authoritative of all the Talmudists, and the Jerusalem Targum, together with all the ancient rabbinical versions, give it *sceptre*, as we do. In one very respectable manuscript it is found *tribe* or *tribeship*. A sceptre is the fixed metaphor of dominion, or power, political, or gubernatorial. Connected with a *lawgiver*, as it here stands, it must import governmental power, whether in the whole tribe, or in some branch of the tribe.

A fourth term, of still greater importance, is the term *Shiloh*. It is a derivative of the Hebrew *Shalach, to send*. *Siloah*, or *Siloh*, in the Greek pronunciation *Siloam*, is, both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, (John ix. 7.) rendered by a branch of *Apostello, I send forth*. It is better rendered by the word *Apostle* than any word in our language. *Messiah* denotes one character of this promised personage and *Shiloh* another. The former denotes *anointed*—the latter, *apostle*; together, he is distinguished as the ANOINTED APOSTLE of God. Hence are applied to him the words of Isaiah: "The Lord has *anointed me* to preach the gospel to the poor;" and "He has *sent me* to heal the broken-hearted." The Vulgate is very accurate in rendering this word, "*qui mittendus est*," *he that is to be sent*. The Apostle Paul very suitably, therefore, tells Jews to consider "the *Apostle* and *High Priest* of our religion."

The allusion to the vine, and his "binding his ass's colt to the choice vine," is the last item under this head to which we shall advert. Princes and Judges in ancient times were wont to ride upon white asses, or upon ass colts in token of their dignity and integrity. Thus sings Deborah: "My heart is towards the governors of Israel that offered themselves willingly among the people. Bless ye the Lord! Speak, *ye who ride upon white asses*, you that *sit in judgment*, and walk by the way." Moreover, the thirty princes, sons of Judge Jair, "rode on thirty ass colts," and presided over "the thirty cities of Havath Jair in the land of Gilead."* Balaam the Prophet, too, in company with the princes of Moab, rode upon an ass while associating with them against Israel.

The *vine* has often been the type of Israel; and the men of

* Judges v. 10; x. 4.

Digitized by Google

Judah have been compared to a vine, a choice voice,*—(the *vine of Soreki* in the Hebrew.) A person's washing his garments is the fixed symbol of an avenging conqueror, stained with the blood of his vanquished foes: "Who is he that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah; this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou *red*, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the *wine-vat?* I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger and trample them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and *I will stain all my raiment*; for the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come."†

A person "binding his colt to the vine," is the most striking symbol of dignity and wealth, of riches and glory, which the simplicity of ancient and eastern manners and customs in the times of Jacob could afford. These terms and allusions understood, authorize us to regard this prophecy as comprehending the following grand points:—

1. That Judah should be pre-eminent in riches, power, and glory, amongst all the tribes of Israel.

2. That this tribe should be most successful in war.

3. That the gubernatorial or regal power of this tribe should continue till the Apostle of God, or the Shiloh, should come.

4. That the nations should assemble under his banner.

5. That he should be a successful leader and prince, and freely dispense "the wine and milk" of heavenly life amongst mankind.

Such are the good things foretold of Judah by his father Jacob, when as yet the whole posterity of Israel were not more than one hundred souls!

And for the historic facts in development of this prediction:—

1. That Judah should be pre-eminent in praise and renown. Is it not enough that all the nation are called from him, and for him, *Jews?* and that the land itself is called *Judea?* To the people of Judah was assigned the *first lot* in the promised land,

* Psalm lxxx. 8: Hosea x. 1: Isai. v. 1—7: Jer. ii. 21. † Isai. lxiii. 1—6.

Digitized by Google

and that too by God himself. In all the marchings and encampments of Israel in the wilderness Judah led the van, occupied the eastern position, and moved first. The tribe, too, was the most powerful of any of the tribes, containing in all in the first encampment 74,600 men of war, more than 24,000 over the average number of all the twelve tribes, being then together 603,550 men of war.

2. In all the marches, and triumphant armies of Israel, Judah led the way. A lion on his standard was the symbol of the tribe. In possessing Canaan, the tribe of Judah, under the pious, brave, and venerable Caleb, struck the first blow. The mighty Anakims, living in fenced cities, yield to this bold warrior, though in his 85th year, on the first sallying of his forces; and thus in accordance with the prediction did Judah begin to "lay his hands upon the neck of his enemies."

After the death of Joshua, when the Lord was asked which of the tribes should conduct the war against the Canaanites, he replied, "Judah shall go up: behold I have delivered the land into his hand." And so it went till David triumphantly sang, "Thou gavest me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me." The city of David in process of time is called *Ariel*, THE LION OF GOD; and because of this attribute of this powerful family, our Chief is appropriately styled, "*The Lion of the tribe of Judah.*"

3. The dominion, or tribeship of Judah, continued till the times of the Messiah. Ten tribes were lost ages before Jesus was born; and it was not till the 12th year of Christ that Judea was annexed to Syria and made a province of the Roman Empire after the banishment of Archelaus the son of *Herod the Great.* Since the year 70 of the Christian era the tribeship of Judah is lost, with the whole ecclesiastical polity of the nation; and since that time there is no sceptre, lawgiver, scribe, altar, temple, priest, or sacrifice in all the broken tribes of Israel.

4. The remnant of the Jews that received the Messiah were principally of this tribe, and they with the converted Gentiles have gathered together under Shiloh. The cause of the Messiah, the anointed Apostle of God, with various fortunes has progressed and increased till now, and is every moment advancing to that

Digitized by Google

glorious destiny which awaits the Christian people. To Him will the gathering of the people be through all the revolutions of time, and in the world to come under him shall be grouped together all the sanctified intelligences, celestial and terrestrial.

Thus ends the book of Genesis so far as the prophecies of the people from whom the Shiloh was to spring—of the Shiloh himself, and his cause, are concerned. The "seed of the woman" after the flood becomes "the Lord God of Shem," while Noah yet lived; and he again becomes the seed of Abraham by Sarah; and the seed of Isaac and the seed of Jacob before that patriarch went down into Egypt. As the son of Judah and the leader of nations, he appears in the last words of Israel, and thus all eyes and the expectation of the world are turned to the single tribe of Judah for the promised redemption of mankind.

Under the most appropriate imagery he appears as a victor bruising the head of our antagonist at the first annunciation. As a divine personage, his name is "the Lord God of Shem;" and as a son of man, he is *the seed* of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, according to the flesh. He is promised as a *universal benefactor* in all the intimations made to the Patriarchs by whose name the Lord our God is called; and last of all, the dying Jacob directs our eyes to him as the great leader of our race—the common head of all the sanctified. To him, then, belong the titles of Triumphant Victor, Universal Benefactor, a glorious Leader, the Shiloh of God, so far as the predictions of the first ages of the world are preserved in the book of Genesis; from which we also learn that his cause and people should pass through various fortunes on earth antecedent to their ultimate and everlasting triumph.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Discussion of Universalism.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER—*NO. I.*

Dear Sir,

After a silence of so many months, occasioned by circumstances well known to you, permit me to resume my pen:—

None of my readers will accuse me of any effort on my part to provoke this controversy with Universalists on their peculiar sectarianisms.

Digitized by Google

The proposed discussion with Mr. Skinner, from his own showing, was transferred to him by Mr. Montgomery, of Auburn, New York; and Mr. Montgomery, on his own responsibility, assumed the place of Mr. Spencer; and Mr. Spencer simply addressed me one letter on a single query, without any proposition of a discussion, which query I answered without the slightest intimation of having undertaken, or being about to undertake, a debate on such questions. So the matter terminated, as I supposed, to the satisfaction of Mr. Spencer, from whom I have never since heard.

From October, 1835, till February, 1836, there was a profound silence on the subject of my reply to friend Spencer. In February we published Mr. Montgomery's letter, and replied to his queries in the same number. Silence again ensued, and continued till in June last, when I had an introduction to Mr. M. in the house of brother Shepherd, of Auburn, when I received from him what I understood to be a *challenge* on the subject of my reply to him of February, 1836. It was, indeed, with much apparent modesty couched in this question:—'*Will you*,' said Mr. Montgomery, '*publish letters from me in reply to you on the subject of Universalism?*' or, 'Will you continue to publish letters from me if I continue to write on the subject of my letter to you.' In one of these forms of expression I was addressed on that occasion; and I am pleased to see that in Mr. M's letter to Mr. Skinner he has fully admitted it, in these words:—'Brother Skinner —— June 29, 1836.—Mr. Campbell is now here. It was to see him that I delayed writing to you. *I called upon him this morning to know whether he would publish my letters, if I continued them.* I did not at first allude to a substitute. He objected to me on account of my youth.'

All men of sense, to say nothing of sensibility, will, I doubt not, interpret this as I then did, into a very plain challenge to discuss the merits of Universalism with Mr. Montgomery on the pages of the Harbinger. I looked upon the young gentleman, in the bloom of 25, or thereabout, as quite a promising Goliah, and upon the whole thought it safest to decline the combat: yet, as one does not like to be called a coward, I got off honorably, telling him that as I was going 'down East' to the regions of light, I would, when nigher the sun-rising, in Boston, or somewhere thereabout, rather encounter some of the older giants, the Anakims or Zamzummims of Universalism; for if I killed him, these sons of Hercules would say I only killed a mere stripling, which would be unmanly and dishonorable. I very gravely, indeed, inquired of my redoubtable friend the names of the mighty men in Boston, and he gave me a full statement of their respective merits. But, sir, it may be gratifying to yourself, as well as the public, to know that he represented Mr. Skinner, of Utica, to be as competent as the best of them; nay, perhaps, '*a more ready writer than any of them.*' Of this, however, I will not say much more, lest some might think that the fame which he gave me of yourself was the cause of my passing Utica without a call.

But it has come to pass, that notwithstanding his writing to the constellation of Boston, apprizing them of his communication with me, and my intimating to Mr. Balfour, whom he represented as the most *learned*, if not the most gifted of them all, my willingness to discuss this subject, especially from the attitude in which Universalism stood since Dr. Ely and Mr. Thomas had given a new volume on the sub-

Digitized by Google

ject; I received no invitation to discuss the question, though, as I learned, most of these gentlemen heard me speak while in Boston, and perhaps allude to their dogmas. Having received no invitation, I gave none: for to offer challenges is not my custom. *Every public discussion which I have had on any religious question, has been on an accepted challenge.* On this occasion, then, I appear in my usual attitude.

But now that I am before the public in defence of *the sanctions* of the gospel, of the basis of God's moral government and of all political government, against a system of religious and moral belief which makes *Satan* a metaphor, *hell* a fable, and *punishment after death* a mere bugbear, I trust I have found an honorable, talented, and learned disputant; a gentleman indeed who will sustain that character to the end. As such, I will respect and address him.

He has, however, been too eager for the combat: for he has rushed into the arena without a single proposition, stipulation, or preliminary arrangement.

Were he asked, What are the propositions which we have agreed to discuss? What are the rules of this discussion? How long is it to continue? Who is to open and close it? What are the rules of evidence to be relied on? What the authorities to be admitted? &c. &c. I cannot imagine what answers he would give. For my part I would respond, in general terms, that I never had a stipulation with Mr. Spencer, or Mr. Montgomery, or Mr. Skinner, on any one of these matters.

Certainly Mr. Skinner will admit that there ought to be some such previous understanding, and that I ought to have at least half the contract or stipulations on these very important points, if we intend that the public shall be benefited by our labors. He might spread the controversy over the whole face of the Atlantic, as in his letter published in our last number, and the discussion might continue for years without any beneficial result.

If, indeed, a written discussion had been duly proposed by 'Spencer' in 1835, or by Mr. Montgomery in 1836, and if all the propositions and rules of discussion had been agreed upon and published to the world, Mr. Skinner, in accepting the place of such parties to a discussion in 1837, might have commenced, *sans ceremonie*, as he has done, and gone a-head, as he seems disposed to do, as though he were hasting out of cannot shot of the enemy. But neither of these gentlemen were ever parties to a discussion with me, and consequently Mr. Skinner, in taking their place, as he seems to wish to do, is without law, or rule, or stipulation in the case; and had he not been rich in resources, he ought to have saved his nine columns, or nine feet of argument, till we had got some point or proposition logically before us at which to have aimed his artillery. At present he has lost much ammunition by not waiting the arrival of his opponent. However, it has gone to our readers without comment, and it is to them so much clear gain.

I will not, indeed, incur the censure of all literary men by beginning a debate without a clear and definite understanding of the points at issue, and the rules of discussion. It will serve no purpose for Mr. Skinner to waste time in telling me that he prosecutes a controversy begun; for there was no controversy begun: nor that he continues to sustain a proposition agreed upon; for there was no proposition agreed upon: and hence Mr. Spencer and Mr. Montgomery write on different subjects; and

Digitized by Google

Mr. Skinner has got a little of every thing in his first letter. He may say, indeed, that I have agreed to have a discussion on the peculiarities of Universalism, and have accepted him as a disputant on the recommendation of Mr. M. as a substitute *letter-writer* on something connected with the party; and he may say that I proposed an *oral*, but that he preferred, and seized, *instanter*, on a *written* discussion of something; and that I proposed certain considerations in my letter to him of the 29th November, and that he answered them on on the 23d December, as now published in both our Magazines; and that, without again hearing from me, he commenced and published a very long article while I was attending to a discussion which kept me from home for ten weeks; and that he practically claims the right of beginning when, and where, and how he pleases; and of continuing, *ad infinitum*, or otherwise, as he pleases. All this, and perhaps more, he may say: but I say, and will stand to it, that we have not agreed upon the questions to be discussed, nor upon the rules of the discussion, nor upon the evidences to be relied on, nor upon the extent to which we shall prolong the investigation, and that these are essential matters with all logicians and with all persons who aim at perspicuity, conviction, and public utility. I shall, therefore, take upon me to show what questions I think may be embraced in the contemplated discussion, and leave it with the gentleman to say whether any or all of them shall be debated:—

1. Is there any *punishment* for sin?
2. If any, is that punishment *present* or *future?*
3. If future, is that future *before* or *after death?*
4. If after death, is it *temporary* or *eternal?*

Or, to embrace your views of the gospel in a single question on which to concentrate all the force of argument on both sides, perhaps you would prefer to affirm your gospel in one proposition, viz.—

5. *Is eternal life the ultimate destiny of all mankind?*

An issue can be formed on your answer to any one of these questions.

You may have a dispute about *words* or *things*. You may affirm, if you please, that—

1. There is no word in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or English, which, in its literal and primary sense, denotes duration without end; or that—

2. The nature of the substantive only can qualify the attribute, and not the attribute the nature of the substantive! Thus whether God be eternal, or the saints forever happy, cannot be proved from the words *eternal* or *forever;* but from the nature of the substantive *God*, the substantive *saints*, or the substantive *happiness*. This would seem to embrace one of those points on which you feel most strong. Hence, that—

3. Unless there be something in the nature of misery which makes *eternal* mean *duration without end*, no living person can prove that *eternal*, prefixed to misery, means misery without end; and that unless there be something in happiness which is of necessity endless, as there is in God, no epithet can be found which would certainly indicate it. Or,

4. You may affirm that *gehenna*, *tartarus*, *sheol*, *oulem*, *hades*, *aioon*, *aioonos*, *aevum*, &c. &c. separate or together, afford no certainty whatever on the future destiny of man; and thus we may have a *logomachy* most preposterous and uninteresting to ninety-nine of every hundred of our readers. For debates of this sort afford to the weak party a great

Digitized by Google

facility of throwing dust in the eyes of the great mass, while they escape exposure in the panoply of bold and confident assertion, which with many is more convincing than all the syllogisms of logic or the whole syntax of reason.

If, then, you prefer a dispute about *words* rather than *things*, you will select one or more of these four propositions, or some of similar categories and predicaments; but if you go for *things*, or for approaching the main point at once, meet me on such of the first four questions as you may suppose will afford an issue, which you will ascertain by answering those questions with a Yes or No; or meet me on the *fifth*, which is, after all, the marrow and fatness of Universalism.

Now for the evidence which may be introduced in the discussion: on which I beg leave to suggest—

1. That a future state being wholly a matter of revelation, no other witnesses than the Apostles and Prophets, or the Spirit of God speaking in them, can be admitted as of any authority.

2. That their testimony on the subject is complete in the Old and New Testaments, especially in the latter.

3. That the words of the Bible are to be subjected to the canons of criticism or laws of language current in the commonwealth of letters; and that no new, or by-laws, other than those to which all writings of the same antiquity are subjected, can be admitted in the interpretation of any disputed word or sentence.

4. That King James' version shall be ultimate in every appeal to translations; or if the gentleman choose, I will not object to the new and improved version on the basis of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge.

And finally for the Rules of Discussion:—

1. As the challenge came from the Universalists, and as they have opened the discussion, the propositions discussed shall be so framed as that Mr. Skinner take the affirmative, and A. Campbell the negative. As for example, Mr. Skinner affirms that *eternal life, according to the scriptures, shall be the ultimate destiny of all mankind;* and A. Campbell denies it.

2. The respondent shall of course close the discussion.

3. The disputants shall occupy equal space in their respective periodicals.

4. No letter shall occupy more than six pages, *burgeois*, of the Millennial Harbinger.

5. The discussion shall not transcend *twelve* letters on each side.

6. The parties shall, as early as possible, in every month, forward to each other a proof-sheet of their letters.

7. The parties shall always confine themselves to the proposition under discussion, if there be more than one, (which there ought not if possible) so long as it is agreed to prosecute it.

Such, in our judgment, would be a fair arrangement with reference to public edification; and if our friend Mr. Skinner will assent to it, or propose any reasonable amendment, I shall proceed forthwith to respond to him on any issue which he may form on the aforesaid premises.

For the edification of our readers, and in evidence of the correctness of the views above presented, I shall offer a remark or two on the communications of these three Universalists.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Spencer appears not as a *disputant*, but in the attitude of a *querist*. His plan was to state his views of *gehenna*, *aioon*, *aionos*, *olem*, and *aevum*, as he had gleaned them from various sources; and not finding in them as he reasoned 'any punishment for sinners *after death*,' he calls upon me in the following words:—'Now, sir, if the scriptures, both Jewish and Christian, can furnish evidence to prove a punishment for sinners after death, do let me have it; and if such punishment is established, then I want to know the nature of such punishment in point of duration.'

In my reply to this query, discovering that Mr. Spencer was no very profound adept in verbal criticism, and especially because I wished to state a few plain facts and reasons, I did not dispute with him on the biblical import of those terms; but observed that 'all he had said about *gehenna* and its correlates, and even more than he had said, *may* be admitted, and yet eternal life and eternal death remain the immutable and invincible sanctions of God's last message to mankind, and all his inferences and conclusions be repudiated by every believer of the gospel as *illogical* and *unscriptural*.'

Mr. Skinner was then *mistaken*, when, in his letter of February 10th, as published in our March number, page 130, he represents me as 'giving up *sheol*, *hades*, *gehenna*, as being in themselves insufficient to teach the doctrine of endless misery.' I did not say so. Certainly the gentleman can discriminate between admitting or *conceding* for the sake of argument, or for saving of time or labor, the plea or hypothesis of a querist or an opponent, and *admitting* that plea as incontrovertibly just and true. I trust, then, he will be more observant and acute in future. I never did admit it; but I was pleased, for the sake of brevity and despatch, to concede his hypothesis; and because a debate about Greek and Hebrew words to the multitude of readers is a most uninteresting matter—especially when every thing can be established without such a *logomachy*.

Mr. Montgomery appears to have been more attentive than Mr. Skinner to the qualification of my concessions to Mr. Spencer; for he quotes a part of my reasons for the concession, in the words following, to wit: 'To the extent and application of Spencer's criticisms, and to the style of his reasonings I *might*, perhaps, make some exceptions; but to *save time and labor*, *always with me a desideratum*, I will concede the whole!' Does this look like giving up the import of the terms of this controversy?

Mr. Montgomery also first appears not as a disputant, but as one praying for more light on the subject. His words are: 'I therefore write to present my views on this subject, praying you to point out wherein you deem me to be in error on the momentous question of scriptural knowledge.'

Mr. Spencer appears not in defence of Universalism, but as a querist. Mr. Montgomery defends Universalism against my remarks on Spencer's inferences; but with him I had no controversy about terms or inferences. If, however, I must go into an examination of the terms, I shall show that the common translation is a very fair representation of the original, and that by an English concordance it is quite possible for a mere English scholar to arrive at as much certainty concerning the future destiny of all mankind, as from all the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Bibles and lexicons on earth.

Digitized by Google

As it would be incompatible to reply to your March letter to me, while as yet the preliminaries are open and unsealed, and no proposition logically before us, I beg to enter my *caveat* against one species of debating growing into esteem in some places.

The *ad captandum* style of controversy, a species of rhetoric for effect, is much in fashion now-a-days in Rome—and Cincinnati. I had concluded that Roman Catholics had got a patent for it in this country, but I see one of the editors of your paper has got a hand in it some way or other. Speaking of myself, under date of the 3d February, in reference to this controversy, you say: 'If he (myself) does succeed in putting down Universalism, at which he aims, he will accomplish a great thing—a thing, by the bye, which *no other man* has ever yet succeeded in accomplishing.' I could find some other fine specimens of this style in your letter of March, but I dare not touch them at present. Permit me to say of this stroke of policy, that the class that are caught by it are much in need of Universalism. What cause was ever put down by a single discussion, or by one or two efforts? Was corrupt Judaism—was any system of idolatry or of false philosophy thus put down and destroyed by the Apostles? Has Romanism, Mahometanism, or Infidelity been put down by all the efforts of a thousand years! And what does this prove?—that Romanism, Mahometanism, or Scepticism is true and righteous? or that those opposed to them are in error or imbecile? What else could you mean by it!! Let us, then, have no more of this lure. They are silly birds that are caught in such a snare. I do not think that if the twelve Apostles were with us in disguise, and to debate every day as Paul used to do, they could put down Romanism, Mahometanism, Paganism, or any other erroneous or corrupt *ism* in twice seven years. Still they would do a great deal; and we hope to do something for the truth, and to keep alive the ancient 'enmity between thy seed and her seed,' till the time when the saints shall possess the kingdom.

I profess in the spirit of candor and of truth to discuss the points at issue, and I trust that I shall be met in the same spirit and style. I regret that the preliminaries were not arranged before you commenced. It is better, however, as the case is, *to* await their acceptance, than to put to sea without compass, or pilot, or port in view. I have no doubt but much time and many words will be saved by a due regard to the oracles of reason, of logic, and of experience, in the commencement. In order to expedite, as much as possible, the discussion, I request either the acceptance of the rules proposed, or such amendments as may be substituted, by return of mail, as I shall forward this communication to you by the first mail in April.

Very respectfully,

A. CAMPBELL.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DEBATE.

As many false rumors have been set afloat by Catholic influence touching the late discussion in Cincinnati, it may gratify the readers of the Harbinger to know the impression made by

Digitized by Google

said discussion upon the intelligent mind of Mr. BIRNEY, Editor of the *Philanthropist*, a distinguished lawyer, and a gentleman of high standing and unblemished character. R. R.

From the Philanthropist.

ALTHOUGH we attended through nearly the whole of the discussion, we do not intend to give any connected summary of the arguments. We give no more than our impressions. The debate is in a course of preparation to be published, and we can confidently say, it will be found not only interesting, but instructive to its readers in a matter about which we are all more uninformed and supine than we ought to be.

We found no reason in the late debate for altering the opinion we expressed, when speaking about the former, of the deficiency of Bishop Purcell in *argumentative* powers. He is evidently a well-read man, especially in the history of the Roman Church, and his mind is handsomely enriched with the current literature of the day. His mental laboratory is abundantly replenished with facts. They seem, however, to have been provided rather for its garniture, than for any more profitable use. In the employment of them for the purposes of manly and dignified argument, he seems, in our judgment, exceedingly unskilled and inexperienced. This deficiency arises, we apprehend, not so much from any feebleness of natural powers, as from erroneous mental training, which receives every thing that is *Roman Catholic* as true, and every thing that is not Roman Catholic as false. The debate the first day satisfied us that in the mere struggle between the disputants there could be but little of interest. Their strength was altogether too disproportioned—and had it not been for the various unworthy appeals made by the Bishop to the prejudices of the audience; for his attempts continued throughout, and aggravated as the end drew nigh, to win favor by casting odium on Mr. Campbell personally, we should have felt for him the same kind of commiseration that we do for a man of diminutive bodily size and feeble powers, who, although he is the aggressor, is receiving from his overgrown, two-fisted adversary, good-humored, though long-continued and painful castigation.

Ill as we thought of Romanism before, on many grounds, but chiefly because it demands of the great body of its "*rank and file*" to surrender to the "*officers and staff*" the most precious right that God has bestowed on them—*the right of judging for themselves on their most important concerns for this life and that which is to come*; and because its management is mysterious and sedulously concealed from the inspection of the community, our opinion of it now is tenfold more unfavorable

Digitized by Google

If Bishop P. has made for it the best defence of which it is susceptible, or one that is even *respectable*, it is a deeply contrived system of absurdities in theory and abominations in practice, and calls at once for the examination, that it may meet with the abhorrence of every republican and Christian who has any proper regard for personal liberty or intellectual independence.

Every one present at the debate must have wondered at the strangeness of the scene in this country:—A well-informed man, a good scholar, a learned man, and on other matters apparently in his right mind, insisting substantially before an American audience, that it was incumbent on those who had not already done so, to assign all their right of judging and determining for themselves in religious matters to a CHURCH, some fifty or more of whose HEADS (the Popes) were acknowledged to be now, probably, suffering in penal fires the just recompense of lives spent in iniquity! Yet this he did, and we doubt not with all due sincerity. Nor did it appear less strange to hear such an one, contending that the bread and wine used in the sacrament of the Lord's supper were converted into the actual and *bona fide* flesh and blood of the Saviour. [By the way, if this can be true, does it not strike at the root of our confidence in the testimony to the miracles performed by our Saviour? For if one miracle is to be believed because, and only because the senses of the witnesses report it true, and another is to be believed when these same senses report *against* its being true,—where is our dependence! Lazarus is believed to have been restored to life. Why? Because he was *seen*, and repeatedly, we suppose, *heard* and *felt* afterwards. Now, if the Evangelist had assured us, that after his resurrection, he was still *seen* and *felt* lying in the spot where his dead body had been deposited, and that he afterwards continued motionless and "*stank*," could it be possible in the nature of things, from the organization of the human mind, that we could believe that he was made alive again in this world?]

So far as Mr. Campbell was concerned we can speak with unalloyed pleasure. His facts were judiciously selected—his historical land-marks well chosen, presenting, without the confusion that too often occurs from introducing too many things, his case with great plainness and simplicity. Every point on which we heard him fully, we thought he fully sustained. And then it was all done with such unaffected calmness, such dispassionateness, and such an evident desire to arrive at the truth for the truth's sake; with such Christian forbearance in the midst of provoking assaults from his adversary, (although he had multiplied opportunities for impaling him,) and the most ungenerous treatment received daily from a part of the political press of this city, that had we ever before entertained any prejudice against Mr. C., he

Digitized by Google

would, by his conduct amidst so many and such long-continued trials, have well nigh dissipated it.

Towards the conclusion of the debate, the Bishop increased in excitement—so much so, that on one occasion, during the afternoon of the day previous to its termination, when he supposed Mr. C. had quoted inaccurately from a Roman Catholic author, it appeared almost unnatural.

But we must draw our remarks to a conclusion, with these inferences from what we know and from what we have heard of Romanism:—It cannot be made to consist with free political institutions, nor with mental independence. Like slavery, it demands *all*—is content with nothing less. Its mode of warfare is, to imprison, to cramp, to crush the mind, knowing that when this is accomplished, every other triumph is easily won.

Bad as is our opinion of it in theory and in practice, there is but one way of putting it aside,—*free and fair and generous discussion.* Let there be among its opposers no guile, no malice, no persecution—but give the TRUTH room, and with its naked and unshorn energies it will put this, and every other error, however formidable and securely entrenched, to a full and everlasting flight.

J. G. BIRNEY.

ASPECTS OF ROMANISM—*MORAL AND POLITICAL.*

No. I.

FACTS CONCERNING THE CINCINNATI DISCUSSION.

IN an unexpected manner I have had the claims and the character of Romanism obtruded upon my attention. The public have before them in various forms a narrative of the ways and means by which I was led into a discussion of this antiquated superstition. A system of religion, essentially intolerant, that has reigned with absolute sway through centuries of ignorance and error, naturally inspires its votaries with a proud and arrogant spirit; and impels them, on all occasions, with a haughty and supercilious air, to disdain every rival for public favor; and to regain lost power by offering apologies for its misdeeds, by palliating its errors, by urging its alleged attractions, and by calumniating the standing and character of all antagonist institutions. I could not have believed, on ordinary testimony, that it was possible for Romanism itself to exist in such a society as Protestant America, in the 19th century, and retain its own spirit, and temper, and grand characteristics so pure and unbroken, in defiance of all the light, and liberality, and magnanimity of this age and country. But so it is I now know by experience, that the spirit of deceit, and intrigue, and tyranny is as untamed and untameable as ever.

"Alas! Leviathan is not so tame:
Laugh'd at, he laughs again; and stricken hard,
Turns to the stroke his adamantine scales,
That fear no discipline of human hands."

Digitized by Google

I would have permitted to have passed unnoticed for some months longer, till the book containing a report of the recent discussion had obtained a more general reading, all the swaggering, and boasting, and manœuvring of Bishop Purcell, his brother, Mr. Purcell, the hypothetical editor of the *Catholic Telegraph*, and President Montgomery: but waxing bold in the arts of deception and falsehood, the aforesaid Telegraph is not content with burning incense to the Bishop, and administering the extreme unction of the blindest flattery; but has commenced a crusade against me, imputing to me actions touching the *finale* of the publication and my certificate authenticating it, as false and as foul as were ever told, when their great prototypes wrote books in proof that Luther and the Devil held nocturnal colloquies about the ways and means of mortally wounding the Pope and subverting the Church of Rome.

The constant efforts to impose on the public in every period of the discussion, and while the debate was being printed, and now since its appearance, shows how hypocritical the profession of triumph on the part of the Bishop and his pliant clergy. They afford indubitable evidence of conscious defeat by the very means which they employ to bribe public opinion in favor of their baseless and truthless assumptions. The 'deceivableness of unrighteousness,' of which Paul speaks as an attribute of the Man of Sin, never was more clearly or constantly displayed in my eyes, than since my first interview with Bishop Purcell in October last, to the present moment. Like Thomas, I have seen, and therefore I believe.

Why not let the public read the book and judge its merits? Why forestall their opinions, or bias them for or against either side? But of this again. At present I have only time to state a few facts, without much or any comment, in proof of the glorious victory of Bishop Purcell. This is more illustrious proof of 'his eloquent and triumphant defence,' than the presentation of 'two silver pitchers and two dozen of spoons,' which were in preparation before the debate commenced. They say I went off from Cincinnati angrily, and refused my signature to the book unless the proprietors of the work would publish seven pages for me extra, by way of a review of the whole, &c. &c. The following statement will show what sort of Jesuits can be produced in the Valley of the Mississippi:—

1. It was agreed before the commencement of the discussion, and signed by the hands of the parties, that in the printed report of the discussion an equal number of pages should be allotted to each.

2. The Bishop repeatedly inquired of Mr. James, one of the publishers and proprietors of the book, while it was in press, how we were coming out in respect of equal space, and also stated to me that he thought we should come out even, or nearly so.

3. It was proposed to me by the Bishop, about the middle of the transcribing of our speeches, to have an Appendix of some ten pages, each, added to the work, as a review of the whole; provided the proprietors of the work should agree. To which I assented.

4. From this time the Bishop began to stipulate for leave to make some additions to his speeches on allowing me room for it in the said Appendix. I acceded to this only in cases of authorities, such as com-

Digitized by Google

pleting certain extracts which he said he intended to read, but had not time to read them.

5. He left Cincinnati before the debate was all printed, but saw all my speeches. He left in the hands of Mr. James an *Appendix written*, and the management of his affairs with Mr. Montgomery or Mr. Collins, or both of them.

6. I also wrote an Appendix, and handed it to Mr. James, who told me he had received the Bishop's; for by agreement neither of us was to see the other's Appendix before it was printed.

7. My Appendix was only 24 hours in the office, till Mr. James informed me that the Priests came and took away the Bishop's Appendix, alleging that he had given them a discretionary power over the whole concern, and that they were resolved to have no Appendix.

8. I then told Mr. James that it mattered not to me; that I had written my Appendix according to contract, and that I had by virtue of the original written contract, which was wholly independent of that verbal contract concerning the Appendix, some *ten pages and three-fourths* which I must have, on the ground of said agreement, *as a part of the debate;* more especially, having given to the Bishop, on special request, leave to add certain extracts *on condition that I should have room for it;* and also, that in the Bishop's speeches, not yet published, the proofs of which I had then in my hands, *whole pages were interpolated* that were never read on the stage—and that my certificate could not accompany the work on any other ground.

9. Mr. James assented to all this; said he knew that such was the contract: for the Bishop had told him of it, and had asked him whether I had not occupied more pages than my share: but added that the Bishop was gone, and the Priests objected to my having said pages; but, at all events, had demanded of him an actual measurement of the composition to ascertain whether I was so far behind in point of space. Mr. James measured the whole book, and ascertained that ten pages and thirty-two lines were mine according to contract. The Priests then demanded the original copy of the contract, which had been left in charge of Mr. Collins. Mr. Collins said he gave it to Mr. Hammond, with the Rules of Discussion, when taken to be printed. I accompanied Mr. James to Mr. Hammond's office. The copy could not be found; but Mr. Hammond and his Foreman assured Mr. James that they had seen the stipulation, and had particularly noticed it because of its singularity.

10. I then consented to have the ten pages and thirty-two lines put into small type, so that it might be reduced to the cheapest equivalent in point of paper, which in small letter amounted to seven pages and a few lines.

11. It was then set up, and the proofs sent me before I left Cincinnati; and to this I added my certificate, authenticating the work as substantially correct *when the whole* 368 *pages were given to the public, but not otherwise.* So the matter ended, and, as I thought, to the entire satisfaction of the proprietors of the book; and certainly according to the original *written contract*; as well as by the *special conditions* of the Bishop in reference to admissions as aforesaid, it should have been so.

Now by what means and by what authority the aforesaid seven pages have been stricken out, and my certificate *changed*, not only in place, but in meaning, I remain to be informed. I never consented to such an arrangement.

Digitized by Google

But still more unjust and flagrant, if I may be allowed to express any opinion on this subject: While my seven pages have been in some copies wholly expunged, (I suppose by the expunging resolutions of Priests Montgomery and Collins,) in others reduced to one page—there *is an actual Appendix added to the Bishop's speeches without any license whatever from me.* I suppose the Priests authorized this also!

I do not wish to comment on these facts at present; and I should not have stated them, had not the 'Catholic Telegraph,' an anonymous production, without the name of editor, proprietor, or publisher, attached to it—supposed to be edited by Bishop Purcell or his brother—given a most false and unjust statement of the matter; and, as usual, in all such cases, it has been copied and endorsed by Charles Hammond, who knows as much about the whole matter as is found in the last item of the ninth fact above stated, and no more.

I am now fully convinced, and I was suspicious from the moment the Bishop proposed an Appendix, that he never intended it, nor desired it; but that he proposed it for the purpose of getting permission to add to his speeches on the ground of promising me room to reply, if reply were necessary, to such documentary additions. I consented on the ground of giving him opportunity to make his documents as strong as he could, intending to inform my readers of the fact in my Appendix; and although I suspected the honesty of the conditions, I knew I had by stipulation equal space, and imagined that I could employ it as usefully as the Bishop.

Mr. James, it seems, has taken upon him to break up the plates that he had cast, and to accommodate the matter to the likings of the Priests; for which he may have good reasons. I have fortunately got a printed copy from the first plates as I authorized them, and as he agreed with me before I left the city. These seven pages, *under all the circumstances*, are as much a part of the discussion as any thing in the book. I will yet give them to the public that they may judge how I have been dealt with on this occasion.

Notwithstanding all this Roman Catholic fair play, I can fearlessly say to every American citizen and alien in the land, Read the book with all the candor and attention you can bring to the task; and on whichever side you find the strength of argument take your stand, and act with promptitude and efficiency.

It is hoped that the Protestant press, as this is common ground and a common cause, will be prompt in spreading before its readers such documents as display the spirit, and aims, and doings of this inhuman and overbearing institution.

A. C.

PUBLICATIONS.

THE COMMON SCHOOL ADVOCATE: 8 pages quarto. This is a periodical lately commenced at Cincinnati for the promotion of education. The first number contains the following notice:—

"This paper is published under the supervision of *Edward D. Mansfield*, Professor of Constitutional Law in Cincinnati College, and Inspector of Common Schools; *Lyman Harding*, Professor in Cincinnati College and Principal of the Preparatory Department of that Institution; *Alexander M'Guffey*, Professor in Woodward College, and Principal of the Preparatory Department in that Institution.

Digitized by Google

"Many eminent teachers will furnish articles for the paper. It is also expected that Professor E. Stowe will give the assistance of *his* pen. Professor S. is daily expected from Europe, where he has spent the last year, and will be able to furnish highly interesting information in regard to the systems of instruction in Prussia, Germany, Switzerland, and other parts of the continent.

"*To Subscribers.*—This paper has been established for the purpose of promoting Primary Schools in the Southern and Western States. It will be furnished *gratuitously* to *all* Teachers, School Committees, Trustees, &c. It can be sent by mail to any part of the country for a very *trifling postage.*

" 'The paper will take no part in sectarianism or politics; but the leading object of it shall be to show the influence and importance of schools—to interest the leading prominent men in their improvement—to make known and excite to proper action, the indifference and apathy of parents—to show the want and necessity of well-qualified teachers—to point out the defects in the prevailing systems of instruction and the evils from bad school government—to suggest remedies for these defects in teaching and government—to recommend proper school-books—to describe the wrong structure and location of school houses, and to suggest plans for their improvement—to prevail on trustees, inspectors, and commissioners of schools to be faithful in the performance of their *whole duties*—and, in a word, to urge, by all proper means, every member of the community to give its earnest co-operation with our Common Schools.' "

"All letters and subscriptions should be directed (*post paid*) to the "COMMON SCHOOL ADVOCATE," CINCINNATI, OHIO. As the paper is furnished *free of charge*, the publishers will take no letters from the Post-Office upon which the postage has not been paid. This regulation will be *strictly observed in all cases.*"

WESTERN ACADEMICIAN AND JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. The following is the Prospectus:—

"*Prospectus of the Western Academician and Journal of Education and Science: edited by* JOHN W. PICKET.

"The Western Literary Institute and College of Teachers, at their sixth annual session, in 1836, held in Cincinnati, vested in their Executive Committee, power to establish an Educational and Scientific Journal, and to select an Editor adequate to carry into effect their views, and to extend the character and usefulness of their work. The result of their deliberations is the present undertaking.

"The publisher, in adding another to the existing periodicals, deems it unnecessary to expatiate upon their utility, when conducted with talent, and on liberal principles. Nor does he wish to excite expectations which may not be realized. The spirit and ability which mark a work must be the criteria by which an estimate of its value can be formed. If a high and manly character can be imparted to it, a doubt cannot exist of success. The publisher, hence, feels confidence that those who originated the undertaking will exert their united talent to make the present work worthy of public support.

"As the advance of sound education, literature, and science, is the object of this work, all matter of a sectarian or a political nature will be irrelevant, and excluded. The benefit of the people, and those whose profession it is to instruct, precludes all interference in controversial subjects of this nature. On all others, rigid integrity and impartiality will govern. Neither birthplace nor geographical lines ought to be known or acknowledged in the republic of literature and science, which should have no bounds but those of truth and intellect. According to the spirit of these remarks the work will be conducted

"All writers for the Academician are requested to affix their names to their articles.

"CONDITIONS.—*The Western Academician* will be published monthly, commencing in March next, and each number will contain 56 medium octavo pages, at Three Dollars a-year, payable *invariably in advance.*

"All subscribers must commence with the volume, and no subscription will be received for less than one year.

"Professors in Colleges, Teachers, and Post-Masters throughout the United States, are requested to act as agents, and every seventh copy will be given as a compensation.

"All communications concerning the Western Academician may be addressed, *post paid*, to ELI TAYLOR, *Cincinnati*, Ohio.

"*January*, 1837."

CHRISTIAN REFORMER. This publication is discontinued. At the request of the Editor we give place to the following advertisement in relation thereto:—

"Owing to reasons announced in the concluding article of the last number of this work, I have discontinued, or rather, *suspended* its publication, notwithstanding its favorable reception, rapidly increasing list of subscribers, and good prospect for success. As I have between 8 and 900 sets of the work on hand, it was my intention, as expressed in that article, to have made an arrangement with some eastern publishing house to have them bound and disposed of; but the demand for the volume, and the promised exertions of brethren to dispose of it for me to subscribers, induce me to change my intention, and abandon the arrangement, at least for some time. The volume contains a great variety of original and selected matter on the cardinal topics discussed by us, with but very little ephemeral and not of permanent value and utility, and will be as valuable in future as when

Digitized by Google

published. As it was intended to precede others, the publication of which it is my intention to *resume* at some future time, it is prefatory in its matter and arrangement; and the possession of it, of course, desirable to all who intend to take the work when published again, who have an opportunity now of procuring it, and on terms which they may not meet with again. The price will be $2,00, stitched and in printed covers, with a title-page, table of errata, and copious index. Persons who obtain and pay for *ten* subscribers will be entitled to a copy *gratis*. When the expenses and losses are deducted, this will leave me but little, if any, remuneration As there is another *Concord* in this state, persons wishing to obtain the work must be particular in addressing me at *Humility Post-Office*, Concord, *Callaway* county, Kentucky. JNO. R. HOWARD.

"March 13th, 1837.

☞ "Our periodicals will please copy the above, accompanied by such remarks as they may think proper, as they are generally acquainted with the work. J. R. H."

CHRISTIAN PANOPLIST. We have received the first two numbers of this work, which are neatly printed, and contain a number of interesting articles.

THE CHRISTIAN. This is a new periodical; 24 pages 12mo., monthly; edited by J. T. Johnson and Walter Scott, Georgetown, Ky.—at $1,00 per annum.

News from the Churches.

JACOBS CREEK, Fayette county, Pa., Feb. 16, 1837.

THE present Pastor of the Baptist church at Mount-Pleasant has lately been attempting to show (to use his own words) the "monstrous claws of Campbellism." The day being appointed, he came forth with a few garbled extracts from your writings, furnished by some one as candid as himself; (the gentleman admits he never read your writings, yet he says they are erroneous in every sense of the word,) which, together with a few texts of scripture, were made the theme of discussion for two or three hours.

However, a few days afterwards, in the same house, and before a large congregation, brother Young, in analyzing the discourse, did show to the satisfaction of many, that your writings had been misrepresented, and the scriptures grossly perverted. And as another specimen of the candor of our opponents, I would just mention the fact, that another Baptist teacher present, said, at the close of brother Young's discourse, he had no objection to the sentiments he advanced, but charged him with insincerity.

Connected with these movements, the church met on last Saturday for business; when the following preamble and resolution were adopted:—

"Whereas some persons, members of this church, are in the habit of fellowshipping that body of people calling themselves disciples, in breaking bread, and consequently in doctrine, which we believe to be erroneous; and in so doing wound the feelings of other members of the church, and disregard the declared will of the church—Therefore,

Digitized by Google

"*Resolved*, That any member of the church embracing the fellowship of that body of people in future, will no longer be considered a member of this church."

Now this decree appears to be in direct violation of the following declaration, extracted from their Church Covenant:—

"We receive no human production, no formula, creed, modification, or arrangement of men, or of men's devising, as the standard of our faith. The divinely inspired and well authenticated Record of Heaven alone is our creed and code of laws—our only rule of faith and behaviour. We know no other bond of union among ourselves than faith in Christ, and a life of obedience to him, which is a life of holiness"——inasmuch as they concede to us the character we profess to sustain; and as they, in all their deliberations in reference to its adoption, did not refer directly or indirectly to that good Book for precept or example to justify their conduct. But to cap the climax to this solemn mockery, upon application being made for the purpose, they positively refused to grant letters of dismission to some of their prominent members who protested against this unrighteous measure, from the apprehension that they intended to unite with us; thus illustrating what some of their teachers inculcate, that the word of God is a dead letter.

I would just observe in conclusion, that this departure from their avowed principles has been effected through the influence of one or two individuals, whose efforts in this affair are likely to produce a re-action, as a number of the most valuable members are much disgusted, and the whole transaction is calculated to promote the cause which it was designed to injure.

DAVID NEWMYER.

WARREN, O., December 15, 1836.

The meeting of the teaching brethren commenced at this place on the 9th and closed on the 13th inst. Present with us, brethren Bentley, Rudolf, M. Bosworth, Henry, and Applegate.—Although information of this meeting was given so late that several brethren could not consistently vary their appointments in advance so as to attend; and some others hearing this, said, 'Therefore I go not;' but rather to our regret hindered others that had determined to go, yet notwithstanding this, and the unpropitiousness of the weather a part of the time, we had a very interesting, and, we trust, a very profitable meeting.

We are not left to doubt that the brethren one and all felt much profited by corrections, instructions, and reproofs on this occasion, relating to their respective discourses, &c. and also much edified, not only by preaching, but by the free interchange of views on several scriptural subjects in fireside conversation, and that all parted with increased regard for each other and increas-

Digitized by Google

ed devotedness for the cause of truth. In making this communication we are but fulfilling the unanimous request of the brethren present, who, as well as some absent, whose wishes are known, desire you to give notice in the Harbinger of another meeting of the teaching brethren and others, to commence at this place *on Friday evening before the first Lord's day in December next*, at which time and place your attendance, together with that of the preachers generally on the Western Reserve and adjacent counties, is most respectfully requested, all things concurring.

C. BOSWORTH,
JONAS HARTSELL.

P. S. At this meeting one, and at a late meeting at Austintown four persons were introduced into the kingdom of the King of kings.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va. March 18, 1837.

The good cause bids fair to do well and prosper here, notwithstanding the many difficulties it has had to encounter. We have labored under great inconvenience during the winter for the want of a comfortable meeting house. We have one on a par with the rest in the place, now being erected, which we hope will be finished in two months. It is built by the brethren themselves. Under all the discouraging difficulties, however, under which we have labored, we have had more added to our numbers during the last winter than have been added perhaps to all the sects together in the place. The church is uniform and diligent in her attendance upon all the institutions of the Lord. The members are prudent, united, and interested in the progress of truth and the conversion of the world; and unless some root of bitterness should spring up to mar our peace and divert our attention from the *simple truth* and the grand object of its *proclamation*, we may reasonably calculate on much good being done during the present spring and the ensuing summer. Upwards of fifty have been immersed lately in an adjoining county. All that we lack is prudent, zealous, and able advocates of the truth; men who feel it their duty to *preach the word*, and not continually to be attacking the errors of others, as if they were more delighted to dwell upon the errors of men, than the sublime beauties and marvellous themes opened to view in the gospel of Jesus. We would rather have one proclaimer, whose mind is filled with a knowledge of the scriptures, and whose heart is warmed and roused by love to God and love to man, than a dozen men who delight to fan the flame of prejudice and kindle the elements of discord and strife, we care not how superior their talents may be.

Let me conclude, by renewing the request of many, that you would visit us soon.

JAMES W. GOSS.

[*Other letters on file are deferred for want of room.*]

Digitized by Google

QUERIES.

1. Is the Zachariah, who is called son of *Barachiah*, Matth. xxiii. 35., the same spoken of as the son of *Jehoiada*, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. 21.?

C. F. R. SHEHANE.

Ans.—Jerom thinks it is the same person. Zachariah son of Jehoiada was slain in "*the* court of the temple;" doubtless, the court *of the priests*, which was between the altar and the sanctuary. It is more probable that Jehoiada had two names and was called also Barachiah, or that it is a mistake of some transcriber, than that Zachariah the grandson of Iddo is meant, of whom no such thing is any where recorded.

2. What Prophet said Jesus should be called a Nazarene, as stated Matth. ii. 23?

ID.

Ans.—Matthew only refers to the Prophets in general. Some suppose the consecration and separation of the Nazarites, and their purity, to have been a type or prophetic emblem of Christ, who was 'holy, undefiled, and *separate* from sinners.' Others think Matthew alludes to those passages in which he is called a BRANCH—in Heb. *Nezer*. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch [*nezer*] shall grow out of his roots." Is. xi. 1.; lx. 21. "I will bring forth my servant THE BRANCH." Zech. iii. 8. "Behold the man whose name is THE BRANCH." Id. vi. 12. Zechariah, however, uses a different word, [*zemah*,] as Isaiah also does, iv. 2.; and Jeremiah xxii. v. Both terms are employed to denote The Branch—The Messiah.

R. R.

POETRY.

From the National Gazette.

THE HARP OF JUDAH.

Air—GRAMACHREE.

O Harp! that once in Judah's hall,
In sweet inspiring strain,
Entranc'd the fiery soul of Saul,
And sooth'd a monarch's pain:
How oft, when o'er my earthly joys
Runs ruin's ruthless stream,
I welcome thy consoling voice—
Thy heaven-directing theme.

Though gone the hand that wak'd thee first,
Though clos'd the minstrel's eye,
And those who caught thy early burst
Of glory, are not nigh;
Of thee no string is broken yet;
Thy deep and holy tone
Can make me every care forget,
And dream of heaven alone.

O Harp! if Judah's shepherd flung
Such charms around his theme,
When o'er Time's distant scenes he hung
In dim prophetic dream;
What *now* thy spell, if David's hand
Once more could wake thy strains,
And tell to every distant land—
The *Lord Immanuel* reigns!

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER V.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *May*, 1837.

REFORMERS *NOT* SCHISMATICS;

OR,

THE "BAPTIST REGISTER" AND THE CHARGE OF SCHISM.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 151.]

"These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination to him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood; a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and *him that soweth discord among brethren*." PROV. vi. 16—19.

WE laid before our readers, last month, our friend Beebee's charge of schism, and now proceed still farther to show that schismatism is not our sin. In the first place, then, partyism is positively and directly contrary to our declared principles. Our past writings are fearlessly appealed to in proof of this: for if there be any one feature more characteristic than another of our stereotyped testimony against the mistakes and faults of this age, it is our uniform and constant declaration that parties or denominations among Christians are evil, and only evil, and that continually.

In proof of this specification we have alleged many portions of the inspired Record, such as Paul's affirmation that division among Christians is clear proof of carnality—of walking as men in the flesh: 'For,' says he, 'while one of you says I am of Paul; and another, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ, are you not *carnal*, and walk as men?' Also, our Lord's prayer, in which he prays for the most perfect union of all believers as essential to the full credit of his mission and the salvation of the world, and his positive and express declaration that every house, family, or kingdom in which there are schisms and dissen-

Digitized by Google

sions must ultimately come to ruin. These, with numerous portions of holy writ in proof of the evil spirit of discord, have been annually laid before our readers as dissuasives against partyism, and as incentives to union, peace, and amity amongst the professed followers of the Prince of Peace. And we now reiterate it as our full conviction, that had not Christians fallen out by the way, they had learning, and zeal, and money enough to have spread the gospel from sea to sea, and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth, long before the 19th century. The Paganism of more than half the globe is the splendid trophy which the Christian sects have won in their intersectional wars about words and opinions. Where would have been the mosques and pagodas, the temples, altars, and victims of Islamism and Paganism, if the multitude of the disciples had progressed, or continued as they began, to walk in love and to 'maintain unity of spirit by the bonds of peace'? But they did not; and the consequence has been, that the gospel, like Sampson in the hands of the Philistines, has been shorn of its strength. For the pulse of life beats not more naturally than we judge the tree or the system by its fruits. If, then, the gospel has failed to fill the world of its professors with peace, and love, and unity, the idolators, mammonites, and sceptics of every school will retort upon the church, 'Heal yourselves, be reconciled to one another before you ask us to be reconciled to your religion.'

To me it appears, and for a quarter of a century it has appeared, that Christians owe it to themselves, to the Lord, and to the world, to make a burnt-offering of their partyisms—their human opinions, traditions, and abstract speculations, upon the altar of their philanthropy. If, even since the Protestant Reformation, all that separated from the Church of Rome had remained one and undivided, the Man of Sin would, like Dagon, before the Ark of the Lord, have been broken to pieces, and the gospel would already have resounded from pole to pole. True, indeed, it is not a united worldly hierarchy, subduing nations by the sword of political conquest, but a union in truth, and love, and holy co-operation, as fellow-citizens of a spiritual kingdom, that would have conquered, or is adapted to conquer, the world. If such a union now existed, in half a century the number of Christians and of public advocates of Christianity would, we have many reasons to think, be at least doubled, perhaps quadrupled.

But this cannot be accomplished—a union amongst Christians cannot be effected, simply because they *will* not. If they *would*, but *could* not, the fault would not be theirs; but if they *could*, and *would* not, then must they answer for it in the day of the Lord's coming. They are not, however, to answer for it in classes, nor in the aggregate; but every indivi-

Digitized by Google

dual must answer for himself, so far as he by any act or deed contributed to separate and alienate, or to keep separated and alienated, redeemed sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty.

Talk about it lightly as we may, it is no little sin, no inconsiderate evil to sow discord among brethren. He that does so is 'an abomination to the Lord,' as preaches the wise man. And those that cause divisions are to be 'marked and avoided' as leprous persons. 'Their word eats like a cancer.' I would regard him as my greatest enemy who would seek to separate, estrange, and alienate my children from one another. Is it less offensive to the heavenly Father to set at variance his children!—those for whom Christ died! Now that divisions among Christians, or different Lord's tables, can exist without offence to the Lord and his people, it must be proved that there are just and sinless causes of division in the family of God. But who can state a righteous cause of discord amongst the brethren of Christ? I answer, No man. Zeal against any opinion, or set of opinions, not subversive of '*holding the head*,' (Christ,) is rather itself a sin, than a just cause of division. There is one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one hope, one body, one spirit, one God and Father of all. Why, then, two parties? Why not one family as one Father? One body as one head? Why not one fold as one Shepherd? No speculation, nor opinion, nor tenet, nor doctrine that will not dissever a man from Christ, can authorize any person for non-fellowshipping him as a child of God.

It is, indeed, impossible but that the Christian community may be regarded as a sect, so long as there is a Pope or a Caliph—so long as there is a Jew, a Mahometan, or a Pagan. This is allowable. Therefore the Christians were at the beginning 'a *sect* every where spoken against:' but there cannot rightfully be a *sect among Christians*. Who, then, is the schismatic, the sectary so obnoxious to the displeasure of the Lord, so injurious to his cause and people? It is not he that refuses to subscribe, but he that constrains subscription to some manism, or humanism, or opinion, or tradition not taught in the scriptures. It is the *inventor* of a neologism, not the *dissenter* from it. It is not the man who will bear with matters of opinion, but he who imposes his own opinions, or the opinions of other men, upon his brethren on pain of excommunication.

To be 'clear from the blood of all men' a person must be truly *catholic*, and '*declare the whole counsel of God*,' and then be silent. He may give his views on any matter not prohibitted; but must not make his own views a standard for any other person's views. They are private property. The gospel facts, ordinances, precepts, promises, are public property. No person can violate, neglect, or dispense with any one of

Digitized by Google

these and be innocent. But to build a party upon a class of comments, or of dogmas, or of speculative opinions, or on personal predilections for a human leader, is treason against Christ, and positively subversive of his government.

Now it so happens that amongst those called evangelical sects, there is a very general harmony in all the great facts, precepts, and promises of the New Institution. So far, then, as they are distinct parties, they are built not on fundamentals, but on circumstantials, themselves being judges. They allow each other to be right in the great matters, and wrong only in the minor matters. But their error is, that they prefer the minor causes of division to the major causes of union, and give to their circumstantials or expediencies the weight, and reason, and authority due only to their own essentials. They would rather be sects because of the accidentals, than united in one great communion because of the essentials. But still worse, they make a *new foundation of union which is the centre of their affections*, in opposition to what Paul has affirmed—that 'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid—viz. *Jesus the Christ.*' Are the peculiar foundations of each of the evangelical sects Jesus Christ?—!

But not to encroach upon the lines that separate the Baptist and the Pedobaptist parties, which appear to be more real than the ideal geographical lines amongst the two classes of parties on each side of the river. There is no good reason which we have yet heard, why all the evangelical sects on both sides of the Jordan should not coalesce in one great communion, and then perhaps they might find out some way of bridging, or drying up, or disposing of the current that runs between them. And here, lest I might be forestalled by some other claimant of original ideas, I would publicly and formally announce the ground just and honorable to both parties, on which they might bury the tomahawk. The Pedobaptists very generally, in their own style, have two baptisms, and the Baptists but one. The Pedobaptists believe in sprinkling and immersing, while the Baptists believe only in immersion. The Pedobaptists also believe in a believing and unbelieving subject, whilst the Baptists believe only in a believing subject. Moreover, all the world admit that an immersed believer is truly a baptized person, while only a part believe in a sprinkled unbeliever. Reason would then seem to say, that he who has two baptisms can more readily part with one, than he that has but one:* and thus both

* I am aware that our Pedobaptist friends may say that we have only half met the case. They may say, that so far only as the *action* of baptism is concerned, but not as regards the subject of baptism, is our difficulty met. We can immerse or sprinkle, but we cannot injure our children by depriving them of the benefits of *dedication* to the Lord. But here again we ask, What command is obeyed, or what scripture is honored, or what blessing is conferred in sprinkling or immersing an infant? *Can any one mention any one blessing secured to an infant by pouring or sprinkling water upon it, or by immersing it*

Digitized by Google

parties might with good conscience, for the noble and scriptural purpose of holy union and communion, meet on apostolic ground; and thus turn all their artillery against infidel Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans, the common enemies of the Lord, his cause, and people. Will this ever take place? If ever, why not now as well as again? If at any future time it should be a duty and a virtue, why not now?

In the spirit of mutual concession, and forbearance on all points of difference, and of united action and co-operation in all piety, morality, and active benevolence; or in the affairs of the common salvation, the faithful in Christ Jesus, 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners,' might then go forth to conquer the world to God, and Christ, and Heaven. Are these views and principles schismatical? Such, then, are the principles and views with which we have set out, which we have cherished, and cultivated, and endeavored to diffuse amongst the pious and devout of all parties. Say the project is Utopian, or what any one pleases; still it must be logically admitted as good and unequivocal proof, that, such being in fact our project, we want no new sect or schism. That we plead for union, not disunion; for co-operation, not variance; for a Christian and catholic, not a sectarian or partizan spirit, we urge in demonstration that the charge of schism lies not at our door.

That we have been most grievously slandered, misrepresented, and proscribed through ignorance, and sometimes through unhallowed passions and interests, must be admitted by all persons acquainted with our history. And that the opposition and ungenerous conduct of opponents may have excited a degree of acrimony and tartness in various instances, may be safely and honorably admitted; but that we have generally sustained every inch of ground which we have assumed, through the fiery ordeal through which we have passed, will be admitted—indeed, has been admitted by most of our opposers, taken in detail. Great pains, however, have been taken to place the controversy on other grounds than that on which we have always placed it. We have been represented as disliking creeds for the same reasons that Unitarians and other errorists have disliked them; because, say the orthodox, *no person opposes a creed but he whom the creed opposes.* This is not now, nor was

in water! What, then, is lost by renouncing, or gained by continuing the practice, to the division and alienation of multitudes of God's dear children! Says one, 'We should lose the pleasure, and the effect upon ourselves and children, of their early dedication to the Lord.' By no means. Dedicate your children to the Lord publicly, if you please; present them before the whole congregation, and solicit the prayers of all the faithful for them, if it will induce or assist you to bring them up for the Lord, or if you think it will operate favorably upon them. Call it not, however, *Christian baptism.* Do it not into the sacred name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Do it only on your own responsibility, and as a means of their proper education and devotion to the Lord. To this I think, for the sake of union no intelligent Baptist would demur. I would not. Perhaps my friend Beebee may now say I am rather latitudinarian than schismatical.

Digitized by Google

it ever our case. We oppose creeds of human opinions only as terms of communion, or rather as signals of disunion and proscription. It is not the *writing*, any more than the *speaking* or *preaching* our views; but the making of them *authoritative bonds of union and reasons of excommunication*, which we repudiate. Violent has been the effort to fasten upon us some very great heresy, but in no instance has it been successful. Even our most uncompromising opponents have, in all cases of moment, been finally constrained to admit that we have been more censurable for what we did not say, than for what we did say.

There is one subject more than any other, the operation of the Spirit, on which we have been more frequently assailed, and more injuriously with the more devout part of the Christian community, than any other. On this subject we have written much, and very much have we been misunderstood, misrepresented, and opposed.

We much regret the necessity that constrained us to hazard so much on a point so vital; but the case was this: We saw two great errors, as we supposed, existing in society on this subject. We still regard them as desolating evils. The idea of physical or special interpositions of God's Holy Spirit, in the way of dreams, visions, voices, and immediate impulses, issuing in swoonings, faintings, jerkings, shoutings, trances, &c. &c. in all the enthusiasm, if not fanaticism, of camp-meetings; in all the ecstacies of ancient Quakerism, or modern shaking and quaking Quakerism, in whatever party it was found, we could not but oppose and repudiate by all the means in our power. Another extreme in metaphysical theology, though less boisterous, noisy, and contagious, though equally pernicious to the subject, was, that a sinner is so dead and buried in his sin, that even after he has heard the voice of God, speaking by Apostles and Prophets, he must wait still for the Spirit to descend and work faith in his heart by a supernatural process before he attempt even to call upon the name of the Lord. Hence the essays, sermons, and controversies upon the metaphysical regeneration of an unbeliever in order to faith.

We have opposed these theories because they are not found in the scriptures, and because we have seen and known them to be most injurious to multitudes. But as for doubting or denying either the personality of God's Holy Spirit, or his convicting the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, by the instrumentality of the testimony concerning Christ, or his dwelling in the hearts of the faithful as a comforter, we have given the world no evidence—unless the opposing of the abuses of any doctrine is to be identified with opposing the doctrine itself. If any one confine the operations of the Spirit on sinner or saint to the hearing, believing, and obeying the word, and avoid the aforesaid two

Digitized by Google

dogmas, we will never argue with him or dissent from him on the subject. It is the separating of the word and Spirit of God, and not the distinct nature, character, or need of both, to the conviction, sanctification, and salvation of the world, which we have constantly reprobated.

That we are not on this topic, on which so much has been spoken, schismatical, is proved from the fact, that we never did refuse communion with any good man, nor with any church amongst the Baptists, because of their theories or preachings on this subject; nor do we now. Let the Baptists, if they doubt our sincerity on this subject, rescind their 'Decrees and Orders in Council,' and invite us into their pulpits and congregations, and thus test who is schismatical, and see whether we will not reciprocate the same Christian civilities throughout the whole length and breadth of the land. And whether they may call me weak or strong in the faith, I care not: one thing I know—it will be as great a stretch for my individual charity or forbearance (if any one prefer either of the misapplications of the sacred terms) as it possibly can be to any orderly and Christian man in all their ranks. Yet such is my love of union and co-operation amongst all creditable professors of Christ's gospel, that rather than make a party or a new sect (I speak for myself, but I doubt not all my intelligent brethren would go as far as I)—I would gladly bear with many infirmities and errors in opinion rather than hazard the evils that must grow out of the rivalries, and jealousies, and bickerings of a party and schismatical spirit. My reasons for all this will perhaps appear more convincing when I shall have delivered myself fully on the *sin of partyism among Christians*. I will expect, on the ground of justice and Christian magnanimity, that as my friend Mr. Beebee has brought the charge of schismatism against me before all his readers, he will allow me to prove to them whether he or I is the more schismatical.

A. C.

EDUCATION.

Noah Webster's *View of the System of Education adopted for the Girard College.*

The following letter is in reply to a Mr. M'Clure of Philadelphia, who solicited Mr. Webster's opinion on the subject:—

New Haven, October 25, 1836.

Dear Sir,

I have received and perused the system of education for the Girard College for Orphans, which you have been so good as to send me, and for which please to accept my thanks.

Digitized by Google

In regard to the merit of the system, on which you request my opinion, I will make a few remarks, although I do not think myself so well qualified to judge of it as many gentlemen who have been in the employment of instruction in our higher seminaries.

The mode you propose for instructing children in the French and Spanish languages is nearly the same as I have always supposed to be the best, if not the only mode of making pupils perfectly masters of a foreign language. An accurate pronunciation and familiarity with a language cannot easily be acquired, except in youth, when the organs of speech are pliable, and by practice, as we learn our vernacular language.

In regard to your system in general, I can only say that it appears to be judiciously constructed, and well adapted for the purpose of making thorough scholars. If on trial it should be found susceptible of improvement, experience will direct to the proper amendments. One remark, however, I take the liberty to make. I do not suppose an exact conformity to be essential to a thorough education. One course may be preferable to another, but there seems to be "no royal way to geometry;" *close and persevering application only* will make good scholars, and this will accomplish the object, without any adherence to any precise order of studies.

But if I understand your plan, there is, in my opinion, one material defect in it, which is, the want of a professorship of the English language, and a department appropriated to accurate instruction in its true principles, and in the definite use of words. My reasons for this opinion are, that, as far as my information extends, instruction in our native language is very much neglected in our seminaries. Young men, well drilled in the principles of other languages, often finish their academical course without being able to analyze many of the most common sentences and phrases in the English language; and the writings of our most distinguished scholars are often deformed by false orthography and false syntax, and by the misapplication of words. From these facts, it is to be inferred that the writers do not well understand their own language. If our statesmen were accurately acquainted with the language, it is to be presumed that they would not use *comptroller* (a counter of the rolls) when they mean *controller*, an officer whose business it is to *control* or check the accounts of other officers. If military gentlemen were perfectly versed in English, they would not use the word *redoubt* (a doubting again) when they mean a *redout*, an outwork in fortification. If the clergy were accurately instructed in the meaning of words, we should not hear from the pulpit a *stanza* called a *verse*. If our citizens were well instructed in English, we

Digitized by Google

should not hear such phrases as a *balance* of men or troops in a company remaining after a detachment has been made. If our public men were well instructed in the language, they would not venture to call the privileges of banking and manufacturing companies in this country, *monopolies*; for citizens well instructed in our language and in the true meaning of words, would consider such a misapplication of terms an indignity offered to their understanding. If English words were correctly understood, we should never hear men talk about the *aristocracy* of the country; since there is not, and by our constitution there *cannot* be any such thing in the United States.

From more than fifty years' observation I am convinced that *words* or *names* often have more influence on the mass of men than *things*, and that the abuse and misapplication of terms may counteract the *best*, and promote the *worst* political measures.

I will take this opportunity to remark on a peculiarity in the institution of the Girard College. If I am not misinformed, according to the Will of the founder the Christian religion cannot be made a subject of instruction, and clergymen are precluded from being trustees, and from having any concern with the education of the pupils.

Now, sir, in my view, the Christian religion is the *most important and one of the first things* in which *all* children, under a free government, ought to be instructed. In this institution it is of more importance, as the pupils will be orphans, and may be destitute of parental instruction.

No truth is more evident to my mind, than that the Christian religion must be the basis of any government intended to secure the rights and privileges of a free people. The opinion that *human reason*, left without the constant control of Divine laws and commands, will preserve a just administration, secure freedom, and other rights, restrain men from violations of laws and constitutions, and give duration to a popular government, is as chimerical as the most extravagant ideas that enter the head of a maniac. The history of the whole world refutes it; our own melancholy experience refutes it.

When I speak of the Christian religion as the basis of government, I do not mean an ecclesiastical establishment, a creed, or rites, forms, and ceremonies, or any compulsion of conscience. I mean primitive Christianity, in its simplicity, as taught by Christ and his Apostles; consisting in a belief in the being, perfections, and moral government of God; in the revelation of his will to men, as their supreme rule of action; in man's accountability to God for his conduct in this life, and in the indispensable obligation of men to yield entire obedience to God's commands in the moral law and in the gospel. This belief, and this practice

Digitized by Google

may consist with different forms of church government, which, not being essential to Christianity, need not enter into any system of education.

Where will you find any code of laws, among civilized men, in which the commands and prohibitions are not founded on Christian principles? I need not specify the prohibition of murder, robbery, theft, trespass; but commercial and social regulations are all derived from those principles, or intended to enforce them.

The laws of contracts and bills of exchange are founded on the principles of justice, the basis of all security of rights in society. The laws of insurance are founded on the Christian principles of benevolence, and intended to protect men from want and distress. The provisions of law for the relief of the poor, are in pursuance of Christian principles. Every wise code of laws must embrace the main principles of the religion of Christ.

Now the most efficient support of human laws is, the full belief that the subjects of such laws are accountable to higher authority than human tribunals. The halter and the penitentiary may restrain many men from overt criminal acts; but it is the *fear of God, and a reverence for his authority and commands*, which alone can control and subdue the will, when tempted by ambition and interest to violate the laws. Whatever superficial observers may think, it is beyond a question, that the small band of real Christians, in Protestant countries, has more influence in securing order and peace in society, than all the civil officers of government. Just in proportion as the influence of such men is impaired, is the increase of crimes and outrages upon the rights of individuals and upon the public peace.

It has been a misfortune to the citizens of this country, that, from their abhorrence of the ecclesiastical tyranny of certain orders of the clergy in Europe, they have contracted strong prejudices against the clergy in this country, who have neither rank nor temporal power, and whose influence is derived solely from their personal attainments and worth, and their official services.

The clergy in this country are generally men of learning, and of good principles. They have been uniformly and pre-eminently the friends of education and of civil liberty. The learned clergy among the first settlers of New England had great influence in founding the most genuine republican governments ever formed, and which, with all the faults and defects of the men in their laws, were the *best* republican governments on earth. At this moment the people of this country are indebted chiefly to their institutions for the rights and privileges which are enjoyed.

During the Revolution the clergy were very useful in supporting the courage and fortitude of our citizens, and in restraining

Digitized by Google

their intemperate passions. They have uniformly been the supporters of law and order; and to them is popular education, in this country, more indebted than to any other class of men. That such men should be precluded from any concern in the education of youth, in a literary institution, is a reproach to a Christian country.

It may be said that the clergy are bigoted men, and often engaged in controversy. But other classes of men are liable to the same imputation; and nothing in the character of clergymen furnishes a good reason for proscribing their aid in the education of youth.

Clergymen differ chiefly on speculative points in religion: in the fundamental points to which my description of religion is limited, they are probably *all united*; and in support of them they would join in solid phalanx to resist the inroads of licentiousness.

The foundation of all free government, and of all social order, must be laid in families, and in the discipline of youth. Young persons must not only be furnished with *knowledge*, but they must be accustomed to subordination, and subjected to the authority and influence of good principles. It will avail little that youths are made to *understand* truth and correct principles, unless they are accustomed to submit to be governed by them. The speculative principles of natural religion will have little effect, or none at all, unless the pupil is made to yield obedience to the practical laws of Christian morality; and the practice of yielding such obedience must be familiar, and wrought into habit of early life, or the instruction of teachers will, for the most part, be lost on their pupils. To give efficiency to such a course of education, the pupil must believe himself to be accountable for his actions to the Supreme Being, as well as to human laws; for, without such a belief, no dependence can be had upon his fidelity to the laws, when urged to violate them by strong passions; or by the powerful temptations of present advantage. The experience of the whole world evinces that all the restraints of religion and law are often insufficient to control the selfish and malignant passions of men. Any system of education, therefore, which limits instruction to arts and sciences, and rejects the aids of religion, in forming the character of citizens, is essentially defective.

In giving this view of my opinion, I am aware that I expose myself to the obloquy of modern philosophers. But this I disregard; for I have, in support of my opinions, the experience of the whole civilized world, as well as the proofs presented by inspired truth, from the beginning to the end of the Bible: that book which the benevolent Creator has furnished for the express

Digitized by Google

purpose of guiding human reason in the path of safety, and the *only book* which can remedy, or essentially mitigate the evils of a licentious world.

From a full conviction of these truths, I firmly believe that without material changes in the principles now prevalent in the United States, our republican government is destined to be of short duration.

An attempt to conduct the affairs of a free government with wisdom and impartiality, and to preserve the just rights of all classes of citizens, without the guidance of Divine precepts, will certainly end in disappointment. God is the supreme moral Governor of the world he has made; and as he himself governs with perfect rectitude, he requires his rational creatures to govern themselves in like manner. If men will not submit to be controlled by his laws, he will punish them by the evils resulting from *their own* disobedience.

Be pleased, sir, to accept the respects of your obedient servant,

N. WEBSTER.

[*Vermont Telegraph.*]

With the main drift of Mr. Webster's letter I cannot but concur. I do not, however, understand Mr. Girard's Will as excluding the Bible or moral instruction from his institution. I do not identify the Bible and the clergy. The latter he has excluded—not the former. It is indeed disgraceful to the priesthood of the country, as is their exclusion from the halls of legislation; but they are, perhaps, to blame for this proscription. I think they are, and yet I concur with Mr. Webster in the truth of the commendation which he has justly bestowed on the ministers of Christianity. The pious part of that ministry, however, alone deserve the character which he has conferred on the whole. A large portion of the clergy are trained for that profession without regard to their own wishes, morals, or qualifications; and in that class there is not more sincerity, or honesty, or Christianity, than is usually found in the same number of any other calling. But there are many pious and intelligent persons who devote themselves to the ministry of the gospel as they understand it; and most of the good fruits which Mr. Webster ascribes to the fraternity belong to them. And to the efforts of that portion of the Protestant ministry I believe and think we are indebted for our free and equitable institutions, and for all those superior excellencies of Protestant countries, by which they are easily distinguished from Mahometan and Pagan, and atheistic and antichristian communities.

I quote the preceding article, however, because of the testimony which it gives to a subject with me of vital importance—the necessity

Digitized by Google

of always associating moral with intellectual culture in every school, from the Infant School to the University. For without this, our national superiority, our national privileges, our excellent institutions, our peace, prosperity, and happiness cannot possibly be enjoyed or perpetuated.

I regret with Mr. Webster, that the too sectarian administration of some portions of the clergy have occasioned their expulsion from that splendid institution. But I trust the Trustees of the Girard College will see that the Bible and moral teachers are not excluded from it. If they be, as certainly as atheism leads to anarchy, or intemperance to ruin, will the Girard College be a public nuisance, rather than a blessing to Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. Intellectual, without moral culture, rather capacitates its subjects for imitating one of the most brilliant and most mischievous geniuses in the universe, the adversary of both God and man, than for serving either God or man. A. C.

POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. IV.*

The man of sense and the man of faith derive their controlling and supreme principles of action from two different worlds. The man of sense has within his horizon only such objects as excite his appetites and passions, those strong impellant forces of animal effort and enterprize; whereas the man of faith has within his mental vision objects of such superlative excellence and value as incomparably transcend all earth-born objects of pursuit, and throw into the shade, in forms the most diminutive, the largest and most splendid achievements of human genius, the richest and the noblest trophies of mortal ambition. Hence, as was shown in a former essay, the power of religion in overcoming the world.

But yet it is asked, *Who is he among the Christian community that overcomes the world?* Does not the present life, with all its pleasures and its pains, its cares and fears, its joys and sorrows, its honors and rewards, so far engage the hearts, and lips, and hands of professors, as to make the line that separates them from the mere men of sense so indistinct, that it is impossible to distinguish the Christian from the worldling in the common routine of earthly transactions or of temporal affairs, unless we follow him to church on one day in the week or month, or attend with him some of the more solemn convocations of the people? Are the

Digitized by Google

few religious services during the year, or the poor pittance of worldly property which flows into the Lord's treasury, (so reluctantly given too, if one might judge from actions,)—I say, are these the irrefragable evidences of heavenly mindedness, the all-convincing proofs that the Christian overcomes the world, and is a man of faith, rather than a slave of sense—the expectant of a better world, rather than the contented and firmly attached tenant of the present? If there be other and superior arguments in proof of this power of religion than those which we ordinarily see in the lives of our acquaintance, do let us see them—not on paper, or in verbal description; but let us see the Christian living, moving, acting on the great theatre of life, as one who plainly confesses himself in pursuit of a "better and a more enduring substance." 'I admit,' continues the Christian sceptic, 'that from the accounts given and read in the New Testament—from the lives, sufferings, and heroic achievements of the Christians of other times, there is no lack of evidence that the sons of faith could overcome—nay, did overcome the world. But on whom has their mantles fallen? or who inherit their spirit and walk in their bold and heavenward steps?'

It ought to be candidly and feelingly acknowledged, that amongst the multitudes who profess the faith of things unseen and eternal, there are but comparatively few who appear to be so wholly or so supremely devoted to religion—so "diligent to make their calling and election sure," as to make it manifest to all men that they supremely seek the heavenly inheritance. And that, out of the immense multitudes who in all the great revivals are said to be converted, but few continue in the faith and "hold fast their begun confidence unshaken to the end," is a matter so notorious that it would be impossible to conceal it, did we most ardently desire it. That there are many erroneous views and theories of religion extant, is a very small matter, in our judgment, compared with the fact that there are numerous delinquencies, apostacies, and a very general carnality, selfishness, and covetousness manifest amongst the most scriptural and intelligent professors of the gospel. This is the most alarming characteristic of the age.

A form of godliness without the power, is the most helpless and

Digitized by Google

the most hopeless case which any one can describe. While the *cholera* subdued only the intemperate and the vicious, or the extremely feeble and aged members of community, the young, the vigorous, and the temperate had little to fear for themselves from the announcement of its rapid progress in its peregrinations round the globe; but when it was ascertained that the young, the healthy, and the temperate frequently became victims of this appalling scourge—that it seized in its fatal grasp all ages, classes, and conditions of life; then it was that its approach spread a deep and melancholy gloom over the whole visage of society, and struck a dismaying consternation into the hearts of all. Thus while lukewarmness and indifference, or a carnal, selfish, covetous, worldly temper followed in the wake of error in theory, or accompanied the promulgation of heretical and demoralizing tenets, those who were zealous for sound doctrine and devoted to the faith and sentiments of the golden age of Christianity, felt but little alarm; but when a similar temper and demeanor begin to appear amongst those who build upon a better foundation, and place their acceptance upon the consecrated ground of apostolic principles and practice—then, indeed, have all professors not only reasons for self-examination and serious inquiry into the causes of this fatal delinquency, but of alarm for their own personal safety, lest in the epidemical character of this contagion they might inhale the pestilential air and perish from the way of life.

An age of persecution for righteousness' sake, or of public calamities, is always a prosperous time for Christians and the cause of spiritual and eternal things; but times of great worldly prosperity are always perilous. When Christianity or the cause of religion is in high reputation, flattered and complimented by all; when those who are most religious are most popular and sit in the highest places, then indeed it behooves Christians "with ear and trembling to work out their own salvation;" and to fear lest having a promise of the future and eternal rest, any of them should even appear to fall short of it.

This is, in our country and in our day, the present condition of the church; and such the circumstances by which the Christian profession is environed. May I not, then, affirm that in such a

Digitized by Google

crisis the advantage in every conflict is a hundred fold more in favor of the world than of the church. That the Christian now enters the ranks having the most fearful odds against him, and that to overcome in such a struggle is the most glorious victory that can be achieved. To see a person voluntarily forsaking a throne, and esteeming the reproach for Christ greater treasures than all the riches of Egypt, is a more illustrious proof of the power of faith, than to see one in the humbler ranks of life, in times of persecution, giving himself up to the flames, or the dungeons of the Inquisition, for the sake of Christ and heaven. The times, then, at present, call for all the power of religion to sustain the church against the sweeping spring-tide of prosperity which now inundates this highly favored country. Those of weak faith cannot possibly stem this tide. The current of worldly favor and prosperity will surely bear them down, and a hundred chances to one that their faith will fail, and they will sink, not like a stone, but like a saturated iceberg, in the mighty waters.

Still we feel a good degree of assurance that there are more than seventy times seven thousand persons who have not bowed themselves at the shrine of the gods of this world—that have not had their ears bored on the door-posts of the temple of Mammon, and that are supplicating day and night at the footstool of Divine Mercy in behalf of the waste and desert places of God's professed Zion. In all this class faith triumphs, and the power of religion overcomes the power of the world.

Many, indeed, at the impulse of the moment, without a full perception of the testimony of God, or a realizing view of the things of eternity, or a due understanding of the meaning and design of the Christian profession, have been induced, by appeals to their passions rather than to their understanding, to assume the Christian profession. Such persons, if admitted into a Christian congregation, under an efficient and well-ordered administion, may be separated to God and sanctified through the truth; but if into a congregation destitute of such a wise and scriptural supervision, may be very easily induced to return back again into the world, and forsake the assemblies of the faithful. Of this class we have met with not a few. They confessed what they did not understand, and beginning without counting the

Digitized by Google

cost, soon made shipwreck of that confession. These are found in every party, and under every form of the Christian profession.

Evangelicus is the most useful and successful preacher within my knowledge. He demands from his converts an unreserved surrender of themselves, body, soul, spirit, reputation, and property to the Lord. He proposes Christ and heaven to the people on no other condition than that they believe him worthy of their fullest confidence, and are prepared to part with all for him. Such persons, and only such as can cheerfully thus devote themselves to the Lord, will he encourage to make the good confession. Hence his converts generally wear well. He is not often put to shame with the apostacies and renunciations of those he inducted into the kingdom. After one of his late discourses, a young man presenting himself as a querist, thus addressed him:—

'Good sir, I am desirous of becoming a Christian; for I believe that Jesus is the Christ, and they only are safe who are under his protection: but explain to me what you mean by giving up my property to Christ.'

Evangelicus. I mean, my friend, that as a young lady when she consents to give herself away to the object of her affection, withholds not her property when she surrenders her person; so in our baptism we assume Christ as our husband, and so deeply are we convinced of his divine person, glorious office, and unsearchable riches, that we joyfully give up all to him, because in him we find ourselves honorable, rich, and happy; and we hold in subjection to his will our life, and all that we can call our own. Like the Merchant in the Saviour's comparison, in quest of goodly pearls, we have found *one* of such inconceivable value that we willingly sell all that we have to secure the possession of that one.

'But,' says *Candidus* the querist, 'How can I give my property to Christ? Does he need it? And if he does, how shall I part with it to him?

Evangelicus. Just as you give up your person, so must you give up your property. You hold your talents, education, influence, wealth, life, in constant waiting for the command, or call, or will of the Lord. You may remember to have read in the memoirs of Christ that on one occasion he sent his disciples to

Digitized by Google

borrow an ass. They were commanded to inform the owner that the *Master had* NEED *of him.* Now the Lord has kindly made himself, his cause, and his people dependent on various means and agencies, that he might afford us the pleasure of ministering to him with our persons and our substance. The Lord has need at this time for many laborers and for means to support them; and he sends to many of his friends, and they will not lend him an ass, nor a shilling! They dare not trust him with their property, and yet they will pretend to trust him with their souls! Truly, they value their money more than their souls, else they are more inquisitive as to the merits of him who claims their property than of him who claims their persons.

Candidus. I begin to understand you. As you would doubt the attachment of a lady who would yield her hand and withhold her property in wedlock, so you would not esteem any one a genuine penitent, or an intelligent candidate for induction into Christ's covenant, who would offer his hand and reserve his property for his own absolute control. But would you not allow the Christian to accumulate property or to use the property which he may have acquired for his own support, or for the education and support of his family?

Evangelicus. Certainly; these are grants which the Lord has conferred. Even the Apostle Paul, who had no wife, nor family, and who was specially sent to proclaim the gospel to the heathen, accumulated property on some occasions for his own support, and for the support of those who labored with him. This he did for an example to others, waiving his right to be supported by the accumulations of others. The Lord has taught us by the examples of his most approved servants, as well as by their maxims, that it is the duty and the honor of every saint to provide for himself and family, and to have some surpluss ready for him that needs when the Lord calls upon him for assistance. But to accumulate property to consume upon our lusts, and to withhold from the Lord in whatever way he may call for it, whether in the person of the orphan, the widow, the stranger, the uneducated, the sick, or the perishing heathen; I say, thus to withhold it, is to rob the Lord of his own, to dishonor ourselves, and to prove how deceitful and hollow our professions to have given our hearts to the Lord.

Digitized by Google

Candidus. These principles and views my judgment cannot but perceive and my heart approve; and if I correctly understand your similitude, the Lord allows us, as the husband does his wedded wife, to use our property always in subordination to his will, whether we live upon it ourselves, those under our care and dependent upon us, or whether we distribute it to meet the distresses of the afflicted, or to furnish the means of diffusing light and salvation through the earth. If this be to use the world without abusing it, I cannot but acquiesce in the wisdom and benevolence of the gospel plan and requisitions, and am now willing to make an entire surrender of myself and all that I have, or may acquire, to the Lord—to be employed according to his will, as I may learn it from his word and providences.

Evangelicus. This is to overcome the world in the commencement. To carry out these principles and professions to the end of our pilgrimage, is indeed to secure a glorious victory and to achieve unfading and eternal honors.

So preaches and teaches Evangelicus. Now if his reasonings be correct, and I cannot discover in them any error, we can easily discover why so few professors give unequivocal proof of their sincerity and of the power of religion; because either they misunderstood the import of their profession, or, if they did, are slow to carry it out and practise upon it. Such had need to pray with all their heart, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

A. C.

From the American Baptist.

MISINTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

THE question has occurred to my mind a thousand times, What amount of injury has been sustained by the vast number of topical, spiritual, and mystical meanings appended to the word of God? I verily believe if all the attempts of Jewish Rabbins and Christian Doctors to discover, or give, an occult signification to the plain, as well as the abstruse portions of the sacred oracles, were embodied in folios, (speaking in the language of the Apostle John) the world would not contain the books. Reckoning from the days of Origen, the father of enigmatical interpretation in the Christian church, down to the period when the huge

Digitized by Google

volume of "Keach's Metaphors" was ushered into the world, one is amazed at the amount of human conceit, fancy, and foolery that has been palmed off as biblical interpretation. The glosses which the Rabbins have foisted upon the text of the Old Testament, have only been equalled by the unnatural constraint or needless extension of the simple language in which the major part of the New Testament is written. An ingenuous mind inquiring after TRUTH, stands confounded at the imaginary meaning attached to the parable of the Good Samaritan, by two such celebrated commentators as John Gill and Matthew Henry: while one who should think for himself would be ready to infer that a religious fraud (if there be such a vice) was attempted upon his understanding. Bunyan, in spiritualizing Solomon's Temple, perpetrated as much of mere fancy and fiction as did the author of Gulliver's voyages. And if the fact could be ascertained, it would doubtless stand forth in bold relief, that the attempt at spiritualizing, has resulted in mystifying so completely, that unbelief has been at last the only method of solving the question in the minds of multitudes who were vibrating between truth and error.

I may be asked if I deny typical or spiritual meaning altogether? By no means: I allow both; but in all cases, strictly by the authority of the *Bible*, and in no case by the fancy or opinion of man. There are certain things and events which we know were either typical, or had a meaning different from what appeared by the mere verbal statement, and wherever the Bible sanctions expressly a type, figure, or spiritual sense, then it is allowable, and no where else. And it will also be admitted that scripture facts or events may be so used, by way of accommodation, as it is termed, that we may reason from *these* facts or events to others, as the case may require; but always with due notice that such is the case: thus leaving the original meaning untouched and untortured.

The method of applying a spiritual sense to plain matter of fact declarations, or to mere historical records, is fraught with many and serious disadvantages. To a superficial observer, it may have the appearance of ingenuity, research, and profound acquaintance with the oracles of God. But a more searching inspection into the business, reveals but a shallow mind, a vague imagination, and a daring, if not a blasphemous handling of the Holy Scriptures. Where do such empty conceits come from? Are they taught by the Holy Spirit? If so, where, and in what manner? Any *such* pretence would be absurd; and, in the minds of discerning hearers, such spiritualizers are considered as making more sound than they have sense, and aiming to show more of the preacher than of Christ.

Digitized by Google

If we look at the *effect* of allowing such a course of religious instruction to prevail in the pulpit, we shall not wonder that heresy, and corrupt practice, have so lamentably prevailed in the world; and yet, all is based upon the Bible. Because, if plain declarations will not sustain any given proposition or doctrine, why then resort is had to types, metaphors, and a spiritual meaning, and in this way unstable minds are beguiled from the simplicity of the truth. And then also, if one man, or one set of men, or one part of the church, adopts an indiscriminate use of these, not authorized by the pen of inspiration, then may the whole. One cannot say to another, My plan of spiritualizing is right and according to the analogy of truth, and yours is wrong. The use of these opens wide the door to every error, and the general perversion of the scriptures. But last of all, let it be considered that it is altogether unnecessary, and, of course, inexpedient. * * * The abettors of error have not half the ground to propagate and defend their idle dogmas upon, if they are deprived of enigmas, types, and mystical meanings, made up of human conceit, fancy, and ignorance; while truth, pure, heavenly truth, stands forth in all its native influence, power, and sublimity.———I am yours in the gospel,

BARNABAS.

A METHOD OF PROMOTING CHRISTIAN UNION.

Christians and Christian ministers must interpret the scriptures substantially alike. They must not bring to its explication a system of rules which would be utterly inapplicable to the deciphering of any other book. They must permit themselves to be under the dominion of common sense here as elsewhere. Before there can be any extensive and permanent unity of feeling, such as is involved in the sublime intercessory prayer of our Saviour, there must be a fixed determination on the part of the great body of Christians to interpret the Bible according to the common laws of language, and then to manfully abide the issue of such an interpretation. A course of this nature would terminate instantly half the disputes which now deface and rend the churches of Jesus. Sacred philogy can, with the blessing of Heaven, do much in bringing to pass such a result. Already her efforts have not been altogether unavailing. Existing theological controversies, numerous and violent as they may be, are not to be compared to the gladiatorial exhibitions which were made in Germany soon after the Reformation; in Holland at the time of the Arminian controversy; or at some periods which

Digitized by Google

might be specified in English church history. Eminent theologians of the present day, belonging to both divisions of the Protestant cause in Germany, to the established churches and the numerous dissenting bodies of Great Britain, not wholly excluding some Quakers even, and to the various Christian sects of the United States, are agreed substantially in respect to the rules to be applied in the exposition of the inspired volume. Such agreement is certainly of very auspicious omen. Most assuredly, like results will follow in this study, as in any other branch of knowledge. The labors of Blackstone and one or two other British lawyers poured a flood of light into the previous confusion and intricacies of the English statutes. Occasions of endless strife were, doubtless in this way, cut off. In precisely the same manner will an intelligible, consistent system of biblical exegesis remove at least some of the causes of ill-feeling and of controversy, which have ravaged the fairest portions of God's heritage.

Biblical Repository.

CHRISTIAN COURTESY.

"Be courteous."—*Peter the Apostle.*

A SELF-CONCEITED, self-opinionated, and pert young man, who, instead of receiving the rebukes and admonitions of aged wisdom and experience, retorts, 'That is but your opinion, sir; and one man's opinion is as good as another's: I go for equal rights, and you must not seek to rob me of my rights. Would you prohibit liberty of speech, or of thought, in this land of liberty? I am a republican, sir: no gag-laws, nor privileged orders, if you please!' I say, such a forward youth, or mid-aged man, would not have been more disgusting in the eyes of Socrates, Seneca, or Chesterfield, than is the rudeness and insubordination manifested by some professors of the faith towards their senior brethren in the church, in the esteem of those who would walk in the steps of the faith, piety, morality, and civility of Father Abraham.

Insubordination to parents, teachers, and seniors, is one of the most unpropitious omens in the youth of this generation. A mobocratic equality is made the standard of mental independence; and to plant and cherish what is falsely styled *the republican spirit*, children are admitted into domestic consultations and allowed to debate questions of family administration and economy with their parents. Such pupils will not think it either impertinent or *mal-appropos* to dissent from their teachers, and to discuss with them books, plans, and systems of education. Now should any of these forward and *smart* young gentlemen

Digitized by Google

ever enter the church, they feel it honorable and dutiful to place themselves at par with the gravest and most intelligent members; and would regard the church as no longer composed of old men, young men, and children, but as an assemblage of such sages and Solomons as themselves.

Those children who are not taught to honor their parents at home, will rarely honor themselves by rendering honor to whom honor is due. Nor is it to be expected that such persons will, on their admission into Christian society, be all of a sudden disposed to treat the brotherhood with that respect which of right is due to all the diversities of age, talent, experience, or authority which we find in a Christian congregation.—To such persons, and to all who in any relation in which they stand to Christian and political society, are prone to hold up themselves, their notions, and interpretations as of equal value with those of any other person; and who disparage all differences of rank, influence, and authority on the ground of an absolute democratic equality; and consequently claim for their own speculations all the regard due to oracles of God, and denounce those who differ from their interpretations as in error, and wilfully so; I would crave the indulgence of reading to them a lesson on Christian courtesy from the maxims of the founder of Christianity, and those of his prime ministers and servants—the Apostles.

The following sentences are but a specimen of what the good Book communicates:—

"If," says the Saviour, "you show courtesy to your friends only, wherein do you excel? Do not even the Pagans as much?" "Whosoever calls his brother *fool*, shall be obnoxious to the council." "First take the splinter out of your own eye, and then you shall see to take the mote out of your brother's eye." "Whatever you would that others do to you, do you even so to them." "When you are invited to a wedding, do not occupy the highest place at table—go to the lowest place. Then when he who invited you says, Friend, go up higher, that will do you honor before the company." "Whoever humbles himself shall be exalted; but he who exalts himself shall be humbled." These hints from the Messiah show how he felt on the subject.

Paul, whose courteousness towards all men, political superiors or inferiors, is so remarkable, in such sententious and apposite maxims as the following, inculcates upon all the duty of politeness:—

"Render to all their dues—reverence to whom reverence, and honor to whom honor is due." "In honor prefer one another." "Do not severely rebuke an old man, but beseech him as a father; the young men as brethren; the old women as mothers; the young women as sisters, with all chastity."

Digitized by Google

And Peter expressly commands every Christian to "be courteous." "Treat all men with respect, love the brotherhood, fear God, and honor the king." "Yea," says he, "let the younger be subject to the elder; and all of you be subject one to another."

But if any one desire the true philosophy of Christian politeness, let him study Paul's description of Christian love in the 13th chapter of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians; or if he wish for a model of polite correspondence or communication, we would recommend that Apostle's letter to Philemon as a specimen worthy of his attention. Or does he desire to study the models of more ancient times? We would remind him of Abraham's bowing himself most respectfully to the children of Heth, and of the salutations of Jacob and Esau and the chiefs of Israel; nay, we would refer him to the law of Moses, which peremptorily commands politeness in the spirit of the precept, "Thou shalt honor the face of an old man, and rise up before the hoary head, and fear thy God. I am the Lord." Lev. xix. 32.

These specimens of the sentiments of the Good Spirit speak volumes to the understanding of all persons of sensibility, and show what is expected from Christians in all their intercourse with one another.

We regard it as a good indication of better times, that the editors of Kentucky, in their late Convention, resolved that there was neither virtue in vulgarity nor necessity for it: and that, as editors, they would hereafter treat one another with more courteousness and respect. Christian editors would do well to follow their example. But surely all "Bible Christians" should, on all occasions, and in every form of address, honor their own pretensions by speaking of and to one another as politely, at least, as is usual among the people of the world; and thus prove that they do not regard a mere difference of opinion as positive and unquestionable proof of depravity, and as affording license for every figure of speech that indicates disrespect, if not absolute contempt.

A. C.

Prophetic Department.

THE PROPHECIES—*NO. IV.*

Though the books of *the Exodus* and Leviticus contain no distinct prophecy, yet the phrases, types, and imagery which they introduce become so much the elements or material of the prophetic style, that it would be exceedingly indiscreet in any

Digitized by Google

person to pass these books without due consideration, who enters the school of the Prophets and desires proficiency in that sacred dialect in which is written the awfully grand and mysterious future. In our miniature plan we can only sketch a very meagre draft of these all-instructive elements of the apocalyptic scenes.

Be it observed, then, that the exodus from Egypt, and the journeyings of Israel in the wilderness, to the conquests of Canaan, with all their splendid events, furnish much of that rich and splendid drapery which sets off the prophetic paintings of God's judgments on his foes, and his tender mercies to the covenanted race.

The second book of Moses opens with all the elect people of God in the land of Egypt, bearing the yoke of a grievous bondage under a relentless tyrant that forgot Joseph and the favors he had bestowed on his land and people. At this crisis a deliverer is born; but by the persecuting decrees of an Egyptian Herod, this child is fore-doomed to immediate death. He is saved by a special providence, and receives his name from his deliverance from the Nile. Various and deeply interesting were the incidents of the first forty years of his life; nursed by a Levite, educated by a Princess, surrounded by a Court, his prospects for an earthly crown were as fair as ever gleamed on an heir-apparent. But he was the child of many prayers, the son of pious parents, early imbued with a profound reverence for the mighty God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; early inspired, too, with the sentiments of a Redeemer, he was ready to sacrifice his honors and prospects for the rescue of his enslaved and degraded kindred. His ardor anticipates the set time for the retribution of Egypt and the redemption of the Israelites. He unsheathes the sword of vengeance forty years before the time. He is compelled to fly the palace and the court, and to seek repose in the bosom of the deep forests and recesses of the desert, where, for full forty years, he walks with God, communing with the help of Israel on the sides of Horeb and Sinai, summits of the same holy mountain. There the angel of the covenant appeared to him in the glowing brightness of the burning bush, declaring his perpetual name and memorial to all generations, under the lovely character of "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Moses and

Digitized by Google

his senior brother Aaron are commissioned angels in this glorious errand of vengeance and of mercy, while the former becomes the minister of a new dispensation; and instead of a diplomatic scroll, receives a transmuted rod, symbol of omnipotence; a shepherd's crook, a crosier unctioned by the Spirit of God. This mystic staff—a shepherd's rod, then a serpent, then the wand of Omnipotence, is the sign-manual of a divine commission, alike expedient and necessary for the faith of his own people and the potentate of Egypt. Thus the two angels, Moses and Aaron—witnesses for God—ambassadors of Heaven, combining eloquence and power, direct their course to the palaces of Egypt.

They arrive and present their commission before the sovereign of Egypt. They demand the release of God's *first born son*, Israel, from his tyrannical government, on pain of the loss of his first born. They also convened the Elders of Israel and laid before them the items of their commission, presenting infallible proofs of their mission by the displays of almightiness which attended every signific movement of the rod of God. The people "believed, bowed their heads, and worshipped." But Pharaoh insolently refused, and "defied Omnipotence to arms." The battle begins. God renews his covenant, or repeats its rich provisions, and promises redemption "with a stretched-out arm and great judgments."

The book of Genesis, besides the permanent prophecies already noted, has furnished the exposition of some sacred numbers and allusions in the prophetic department. The creation of the world in six days, and God's resting on the *seventh*, solemnizes and forever consecrates in holy writ the number *seven*. It is the perfect number—the symbol of perfection. It was rendered significant before the flood. God commanded Noah to select clean beasts by *sevens*, reserving the seventh for sacrifice, as may be fairly presumed from all the circumstances of the case. "*Sevenfold* vengeance" is threatened to him that should kill Cain. Lamech also feels that *seventy seven-fold* vengeance guaranties his security from the hand of violence, being so much less culpable than Cain. The Ark rested in the *seventh* month on a peak in Ararat. Jacob bowed *seven* times before Esau his offended brother, as he had served *seven* years for each of his wives;

Digitized by Google

and the son of Jacob interpreted the *seven* good and evil kine, the *seven* good and the *seven* thin ears, as denoting *seven* years of plenty and *seven* years of famine. Thus in Genesis have we the foundation for the seven branches of the golden candlestick, the seven trumpets, the seventh or Sabbatical year, and all the sacred uses of that number in the Law; and in the Apocalypse the seven churches, seven candlesticks—stars, lamps, spirits, seals, thunders, angels, vials, plagues, &c. &c.

The number *twelve* also becomes emphatic, significant, and sacred, because of the *twelve* patriarchs, heads of the twelve tribes of Israel. Ishmael also begat *twelve* princes. The twelve precious stones of the breastplate of Aaron, and the twelve pillars which Moses reared under the hill of God when he sprinkled the book of the covenant before the Lord and all Israel, originate from the same source. The twelve loaves, oxen, chargers, bowls, spoons, bullocks, rams of the Law; the twelve rods, stones, lions, &c. &c. as well as the twelve Apostles, the crown of twelve stars, the twelve gates, twelve pearls, twelve foundations, twelve manner of fruits, &c. are all explained by the book of Genesis.

Besides these, the book of Genesis becomes the occasion of other terms, phrases, and allusions, of much value in interpreting prophecy; such as the flood of Noah, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire and brimstone rained from heaven—the confusion of human speech at the building of Babel—the dispersion of the human family—the calling of Abraham—the covenant of circumcision—the offering of Isaac—his marriage—Rebecca's twins—Jacob's whole life—Joseph's various fortunes, &c.

But the book of Exodus greatly enlarges this vocabulary and sacred imagery; and, therefore, before advancing into the interior of this wonderful history, we wish to fix the attention of our readers on what may be learned from the book of Genesis; that as we proceed he may note down the instructive incidents, occasions, and great events which enter into the composition of the sacred style and expound the figures, symbols, and significant allusions of New Testament prophecy.

Two persons, whether from the fact that God made a male and a female to complete one man, and created all the races of animals

Digitized by Google

in this singular plurality—I say, two persons are, in the divine judgment, made necessary to complete testimony. Hence Moses and Aaron, Caleb and Joshua, the two tables of the Law, the Law and the Prophets, the two anointed ones, Zerubbabel and Joshua, the two silver trumpets, the two witnesses, figure in various scenes of the historic drama. Moses and Aaron are the two great angels of the Jewish economy; and as God furnished Moses with two signs—a rod transmuted into a serpent, and back again, and a leprous hand, he assured him that if Pharaoh would not believe the one he should the other sign.

Ten tremendous displays of the potency of the stretched-out arm of the God of Moses smote the realms of Pharaoh to open a way for the escape of Israel from the rapacity, injustice, and cruelty of the tyrant. First, the Nile is converted into blood, and all the waters of Egypt are transubstantiated; then the frogs, the lice, the flies, the murrain, the boil, the hail, the locusts, the thick and pitchy darkness, the angel of destruction smiting to death the first born of man and beast in regular and quick succession, avenge the obduracy of the king and the injustice of his administration towards the sons of Jacob, and compel him to issue a license for their departure from his dominions.

The twelve tribes, undiminished and unimpoverished by the ten plagues, prepare for their deliverance. The Lord's passover is specially appointed, and observed first in anticipation, and again in commemoration of their deliverance through the blood of the slain lamb dashed upon their door-posts, as a sign that the destroying angel might "*pass over*" the dwellings of Israel while striking the most appalling blow on the pride, strength, and avarice of Egypt.

Ransomed by the blood of their enemies, their first born is consecrated to the Lord, and now prepared for the journey from the house of bondage and degradation to the promised land, they commence their journey.

While encamping by the Red Sea, before Baal-zephon, they see "the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, his horsemen, and his army," close upon their rear, rushing like an impetuous torrent, bursting from the pent-up caverns of some lofty mountain.—Israel, panic-stricken, cries to the Lord. Moses commands them

Digitized by Google

to wait for his salvation; assuring them that they should never again see the face of an Egyptian army. Lifting up his rod, he stretched out his arm over the Red Sea, and its waters obeyed. The channel is seen. The cloud that guided their footsteps, now wheels to their rearward and overshadows them. By night it shone upon Israel like a cloud of fire, while it flung pitchy darkness over the sons of Ham. The Lord himself rode in this cloud as in a chariot. He looked indignant upon Pharaoh's hosts, and they were troubled; he smiled on Jacob's seed, and they rejoiced. Under the cloud, and with a wall of water on either side, they march through the channel of the sea as on dry land, which the Egyptians attempting to do, at the rebuke of the rod of God were drowned by the returning flood. Israel, when thus "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea," shouted hallelujahs to the Lord.

As soon as they were cut off from all other supplies, God rained manna from heaven around their tents, and gave them bread of heaven to eat. When overcome by thirst, at the command of God Horeb is smitten:

> "When Moses gave the stroke,
> From Horeb's flinty side
> Issu'd a river, and the rock
> The Hebrews' thirst supply'd."

Thus while in the wilderness a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night directs the church Canaan-ward, and fed on the manna of the skies, their thirst is slaked from a stream supernaturally issuing from that rock from whose summit went forth a fiery law.

In this mystic journey from Egypt to Canaan, we have not only a picture of the Christian's pilgrimage to the better country, but we have the fortunes of the church in the wilderness and much of the elements of future prophecy laid open to our consideration. In one point of view there is not a more august and splendid spectacle in universal history than this national migration from Egyptian bondage to the possession of conquered Canaan.

After the paschal lamb, their last Egyptian supper, with Moses at their head and Aaron by his side, conducted by a cloud, which, more sublime than any earthly column, moved before this immense army, they proceed to the Red Sea. Its waters separate at their approach. Soon as they enter its channel the

Digitized by Google

radiating pillar covers their rear and hides them from their enemies. Such hallelujahs were never before sung, when, on yonder side the Red Sea they stood along the shore and saw the tyrant Pharaoh with his chariots and his horsemen overwhelmed in the depths of the returning flood. They are hungry, and the windows of heaven are opened, and angels' bread, in the form of manna, is showered nightly around their tents. They became thirsty, and the flinty rock becomes a perennial fountain, whose stream follows the cloud that guided their pilgrimage for full forty years. They long for flesh, and the east wind bears upon its wings flocks of quails, and piles them around their dwellings. The fiery serpent bites them who straggle from the camp; but a brazen serpent, raised upon a pole, by a single glance of the eye of the victim imparts instantaneous cure. Their enemies fight against them; but they lift their hands to heaven, and they are discomfited. They open their mouths to curse; but they are constrained to bless the sons of Jacob. Thus they march onward to the borders of the promised land. Jordan at their approach moves backward to its fountain soon as its surface is touched by the foot of those who bore the ark of the covenant. They walk in safety on its channel, and rear their grateful monument on Canaan's happy side.

But in another point of view their individual fortunes are occasionally most disastrous. Thousands are sometimes slain in a single day because of their flagrant transgressions. A fiery indignation frequently marks the doom of their great men. Multitudes perish from the way because of their delinquencies. God, because of their unbelief and ingratitude, solemnly declares that but *two* out of six hundred thousand should cross the Jordan.

"Aaron the Priest resigns his breath
At God's immediate will,
And in the desert yields to death
Upon the appointed hill;
And, see, on Jordan's yonder side
The tribes of Israel stand,
While Moses bow'd his head and died
Short of the promis'd land.

Forty becomes a peculiar number from the incidents of the wilderness. Moses fasted forty days and nights after the first Pentecost when God spake his law from Mount Sinai. He spent

Digitized by Google

twice forty days in obtaining the first and second editions of the *two tables*. Forty days were spent in exploring Canaan by the spies sent forward; and for each of these days the Lord said he would give them a year of chastisement. Hence they spent forty years in the wilderness.

Seventy also becomes emphatic in the book of Exodus: because *seventy* souls migrated first from Syria to Egypt; because *seventy* elders accompanied Moses in his ascent to receive the law, and by special command *seventy* were chosen and filled with the spirit of wisdom to assist Moses in the government of Israel.

We have already found *two* and *ten* conspicuous numbers. We have the *two* tables of the law, as well as the *two* witnesses, Moses and Aaron, Joshua and Caleb, the Law and the Promise; and from the days of Abraham and Melchisedec, the *tenth*, even before the *ten* plagues, the *ten* commandments, or the *ten* curtains of the tabernacle, or the *tithes* of Levi, began to be a favorite number and of frequent use. These are small matters: but the sequel may yet show that as letters make words, and words sentences, and sentences volumes, so these little things are worth more than commas and semicolons in the interpretation of prophecy.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

ASPECTS OF ROMANISM—*MORAL AND POLITICAL.*

No. II.

I now lay before my readers the pages expunged from the Discussion as stated in No. I., April number. This suppressed portion of the discussion explains itself; but if comments are called for they shall be forthcoming. Meanwhile, those who have read the debate can appreciate their worth. Those who have not, will please read them again after they have read the report of the debate as already published.

A. C.

CONCLUSION.

By special contract, it was stipulated that the parties should have equal pages in the printed discussion: the following pages are mine in virtue of that covenant, and as a part of the debate; because in anticipation of this result, I consented to the Bishop's embellishing his speeches with more liberal extracts than he actually read on the stage. Of this nature, is a part of Judge Hall's beautiful composition; which, being free from logic, I permitted to pass free of censure. Bishop England's

Digitized by Google

beautiful anodyne for soothing suspicions admits all the facts of the deposition of kings, the vacating of oaths, the intolerance and proscription of the Popes, but ascribes it all to the feudal system, and to a concession on the part of the sovereigns, rather than to the practice of a divine right so to do. It would have helped his case much could he have given an authentic copy of such a concession, on the part of the sovereigns; but in the absence of such a document he will excuse us for saying that his apologies for these excesses cannot be admitted for the want of fact. Like the Bishop's exposition of the *spirituality* of his oath to the Pope, it wants the confirmation of the letter. As well might the Bishop explain away his oath of naturalization, as all letter and not spirit, as make his oath to persecute heretics and schismatics all spiritual. But I hasten to a more important point:—

SAINT LIGORI AND THE BISHOP.

The "*Moral Theology*" of the church of Rome as propounded by the *Saint Ligori*, of which Mr. Smith of New York has given us a synopsis, will more convincingly and effectually expose the hideous deformity of this idolatrous and immoral institution than any one work lately issued from the American press. The violence with which Bishop Purcell assaulted the reputation of Mr. Smith, shows how deeply the arrow sticks in the wounded bosom of a true son of the papal hierarchy. Yet Mr. Smith's reputation, however fair or foul it may be, (and a fairer reputation than his among the living converts from Romanism we know not) has nothing to do with Saint Ligori or his Moral Theology more than the types which are employed in this book have to do with the words which I now write.

The question is, *Has Saint Ligori said what Mr. Smith has printed in his Synopsis?* The Bishop solemnly excepts to a single quotation of all the quotations which we have read from that work. On this he speaks with impassioned eloquence. The citizens of Cincinnati, present on that occasion, will long remember in what manner the Bishop pounced upon the Synopsis and its author, when he heard me read on the use to be made of the fines to be collected from "those clergymen who keep concubines" The reader, too, who looks back to pages 219, 253, will there see with what solemn and strong asseverations he declared that no such passage as that quoted from page 294 was ever written by Saint Ligori. "I have examined," says he, "these volumes," pointing to the *nine volumes* of Ligori, "from cover to cover, and in none of them can so much as a shadow be found for the infamous charges."—"I pledge myself before the heavens and the earth that this base slander is what I call it—a lie."—"There is no foundation for it whatever in the works of Ligori."

Be astonished, then, O earth! after all these solemn appeals, and much more, to the same effect, that it is even so as I read it, and as Mr. Smith translated it. And that it is so, I will just now prove to the Bishop himself: I informed my audience that I would search the matter out; not then having time, because of the indefinite and imperfect references in the book from which I quoted.

I have done this the more circumstantially and faithfully, because the Bishop made it the occasion to assail some of my authorities, and again to bespatter them with the mire of his indignation. I rely upon no false witness, no spurious or unauthentic document, and will not, therefore,

Digitized by Google

give up a faithful witness because Dr. Purcell asserts, in the heat of conflict, that he is not a good Catholic. At first, indeed, I had some respect for the positive and authoritative manner in which he asserted some things; but, on farther acquaintance, that respect gradually waned, till at last, even in defiance of the most explicit protestations, it wholly expired. I could not, therefore, on his naked assertion, discredit any author, whose testimony he might please to arraign: more especially when I well knew, from higher sources, that his authenticity or veracity could not be successfully impugned.

I quoted only one Roman Catholic writer in this controversy of doubtful authority. I am not, however, certain that he is really so, in the matter in which I quoted him, for in that he is sustained by other writers. I speak of Fra Paoli. In quoting him only once, I did it with an expression of distrust. But as my learned antagonist has dealt so profusely in assertion on the subject of authorities, I am glad that he has put it in the power of the citizens of Cincinnati, and of every reader of this controversy, to form a correct estimate of the current value of his authority in all such assertions.—His singular attitudes, exclamations, invocations, and appeals, when first he denied that Ligori ever uttered the passage in dispute, gave to it a conspicuity far beyond its real worth, and made an impression on many minds that will be associated with the name of Bishop Purcell while memory retains its power over the past. The Bishop, for effect, called first on Professor Biggs to examine 9 volumes of Ligori for the reference. The Professor, seeing a clashing between the pages, of the edition of the copy on the table, and that from which Mr. Smith quoted, prudently declined the examination. He then called upon Mr. Kinmont, of high ecclesiastical standing, and handed to him the volumes in question. He was to have a day to examine and report. In due time, after an emphatic annunciation or two, on the part of the Bishop, Mr. Kinmont appears upon the stage. An awful silence reigns, the Bishop holds the candle erect by the side of the Roman Oracle. A breathless suspense, as when a Judge is about to pronounce sentence of death upon some unfortunate criminal, shows how the public mind can be wrought up to intense feeling, to a glowing heat, by a single spark. What an ebullition! Mr. Kinmont coughs, throws his eloquent eyes around the crowded galleries, and before he reads the fatal doom of "Smith, Slocum and Co." and justifies the Saint Ligori from such profane hands, he, by virtue of the authority with which he was invested by the Baron Swedenborg, Prince of corresponding shadows, kindly says, "These gentlemen [the Bishop and myself] are fighting about shadows." What a consolation! And by candle-light, too! How easy then to find them!! After this free-will-offering to the illustrious Baron, Mr. Kinmont read as reported by the Bishop. Then was the Bishop's joy complete: for before this paroxysm he even leaped for joy. Still there is a joy that lasteth not forever; and as all this farce was got up by the Bishop alone, on his own responsibility, I felt perfectly self-possessed, in the assurance that if I could not find the passage, I could find the doctrine of it well established; and that good sense and the truth would soon triumph over this ludicrous mockery of evidence and honest investigation.

The Bishop, indeed, prematurely (page 219) committed himself, saying of the extract read—"I now pledge myself to show to every man

Digitized by Google

of honor in the city, that the last allegation read by the gentleman, purporting to be from the works of Ligori, is not to be found in the works of that author."—"I have," adds he, "three editions of the complete works of Ligori in my library, or in this city, to refer to; and in none of them can this vile doctrine be found." I therefore proceed to show that the gentleman's pledge will never be reclaimed; and that he owes "to every man of honor" an apology for his insolent attack upon the reputation of authors and writers who were never placed in such an unenviable attitude as that in which he now stands before a discerning public.

Mr. SMITH, in reply to my letter per Mr. Emmons, wrote as follows—

"The obnoxious passage, then, which the Romish Bishop of Cincinnati calls heaven and earth to witness are not to be found in the works of Ligori, is the following:—

"A Bishop, however poor he may be, cannot appropriate to himself pecuniary fines without the license of the Apostolic See. But he ought to apply them to pious uses. Much less can he apply those fines to any thing else but pious uses, which the *Council of Trent* has laid upon the non-resident Clergymen, or upon those *Clergymen who keep Concubines*."—Lig. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

This passage I will now give in the Latin, as it stands on the 444th page of the 8th volume of the "MORAL THEOLOGY OF ALPHONSUS DE LIGORIO," from whose work the extract was made. The words are as follows:—

"Mulctas pecuniarias Episcopus sibi addicere non potest, quantumvis pauper sit, sine licentia Sedis Apostolicæ. [ut ex pluribus argumentis S. Congregat. evincitur in Tract. De Syn. Diœc. L. 10. C. 10. N. 2.] Sed debent in usus pios expendi. Multo magis non possunt nisi in pios usus applicari illæ mulctæ, quas Tridentinum inflixit Clericis non residentibus, aut concubinariis."—Ligor. Epit. Doc. Mor. p. 444.

The words included in the brackets were not translated, merely because I did not wish to encumber the "SYNOPSIS," (as I have observed in the "PREFACE OF THE SYNOPSIS,") with too many of the authorities quoted by Ligori. I shall now, however, translate the above words in the brackets, much, I know, to the discomfiture of his Reverence the Romish Bishop of Cincinnati. The words in the brackets, therefore, translated, are as follows:—["As is evident from many arguments of the Holy Congregation, in the Treatise respecting the Diocesan Synods, book 10, chapter 10, number 2."]

Here we have, not only the authority of St. Ligori, but also that of the "*Holy Congregation of Rites.*"

Since this subject is now to be probed to the bottom, we will also translate the contracted words which I transferred into the "*Synopsis*," as I found them in the original. The words to which I allude are the terminating ones of the disputed passage, as follows:—"Ligor. Ep. Doc. Mor. p. 444"—which, translated, stand thus:—"From the Work of Ligori, under the head of 'An Epitome of the Moral Doctrine,' page 444."

In order to render the testimony still more striking, it is important to observe that this "Epitome of the Moral Doctrine," to which Ligori alludes, is an Epitome compiled by no less a personage that Pope Benedict XIV. as we are informed by Ligori himself, in the 301st page of the 8th volume of his "MORAL THEOLOGY."

Digitized by Google

That the previous Latin words are truly and faithfully the words of St. Ligori and fairly extracted from 8th volume, p. 444, is duly certified by the following learned gentlemen:—

We, the undersigned, have carefully examined the foregoing extracts from the Moral Theology of St. Ligori; and having compared them with the original Latin copy of that work, now before us, do hereby certify that the said extracts are *verbatim*, truly and correctly given by Mr. Smith.

In this certificate we include, particularly, the passage disputed by Bishop Purcell, which is contained in Mr. Smith's SYNOPSIS, p. 294, par. 7, headed "CONCUBINES OF THE CLERGY."

DUNCAN DUNBAR,
Pastor of the M'Dougal street Baptist Church.
JOHN KENNADAY,
Pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church.
SPENCER H. CONE,
Pastor of Oliver street Baptist Church.
SAMUEL F. B. MORSE,
Professor, &c. in the University of the City of New York.
WILLIAM GREEN, JR.,
Deacon in the 5th Free Cong. Church, N. Y.
C. G. FINNEY,
Pastor of the Church in the Broadway Tabernacle.

NEW YORK, February 3, 1837.

On receiving the above communication from Mr. Smith, I asked from Bishop Purcell the loan of the works of St. Ligori. He politely complied with my request. Turning to page 444, volume 8, I found every word in his own edition as above reported. I carried it and the Synopsis of Mr. Smith to our mutual friend Mr. Kinmont, to whom it was now my time to appeal. Mr. Kinmont read both the original and the translation; and then certified as follows:—

The above (version of Smith, p. 294) I regard to be a *faithful* translation of the passage as it stands in the 8th volume of Ligori, page 444.

ALEXANDER KINMONT.

CINCINNATI, Feb. 27, 1837.

And yet says Bishop Purcell, "I now pledge myself to show to every man of honor in this city, that the last allegation read by the gentleman, purporting to be from the works of Ligori, is not to be found in the works of that author."!!

And again, to prepare himself for an easy descent, as if he had once known the original which could not be found—"The original tells the truth, but the translation *lies*." Mr. Kinmont, his own witness, says, 'The translation of Smith is *faithful!*'

Ab uno discite omnes! From this examination of the single question of authorities, on which a fair issue was formed by the Bishop, the reader may see how perfectly disposable his other assertions, if he had, as in this case, dared to challenge trial.

Far be it from me to judge the motives or to impugn the designs of my friend, the Bishop, in this singular affair. Who would say that he knew that the book which he held in his hand contained every word of the disputed passage; while with an air of sincerity, most rhetorically

Digitized by Google

conceived, and associated with real indignation against Smith, he called heaven and earth to witness, and, if I mistake not, staked his life that no such passage, nor even the shadow of it, could be found in Ligori! But be this as it may, the logician or the man of common sense cannot avoid placing the Bishop in the following dilemma:—He either knew the passage was in Ligori and faithfully translated by Smith, or he did not know it: if he did know and concealed it, and this would be a grievous hypothesis, then his testimony concerning all authorities would be inconclusive: if he did not know it, yet positively asserted it, his authority on all historic facts, if not absolutely killed, is certainly mortally wounded.

I make great allowances for the embarrassing nature of the circumstances which at that crisis environed my friend. Sore oppressed with the disclosures of Roman moral theology and various other facts and documents, of an indisposable and incorrigible character, he was compelled to relieve himself by a violent assault upon the translator: and it had not for a moment the desired effect. Yet in Protestant moral theology there is no case supposable in debate about the Holy Apostolic Church, which would justify a person in so solemnly asserting what could not have been fully understood on the most favorable construction.

Had I been half as well acquainted with the Roman theology of Ligori as the Bishop, I could not have been beguiled into such an error; because I now discover that there is but one volume of the nine which gives an "epitome of the moral and canonical doctrine of the church," under that title—and having examined the quotation in Smith's Synopsis, the Bishop saw the reference to that volume and to the page 444.

But now for the *comment* on the text. The controversy was not about the comment, for he denied the text. True, I introduced the passage for the purpose of showing that amongst the clergy of the Roman sect marriage was a greater sin than concubinage; because marriage procured instant excommunication, while concubinage was fined and winked at. My opponent then denied that the Council of Trent, to which reference was had in the passage quoted, had imposed fines on such clergymen as keep concubines. There is no Protestant who has read those decrees who would say that the Council of Trent granted a license with a tax to every applicant who wished to keep a concubine. That was not the point before us. It was not a debate about a tax, a license, an indulgence, but about a *fine*. Now, as respects the Council of Trent, it is certain that fines are imposed on those who *publicly* keep concubines. Ligori very correctly represents this matter in the following passage:—"A clergyman who keeps concubines, (according to the Council of Trent, Sess. 15, C. 14,) after the first admonition is to be deprived of the third part of the income of his benefice. After the second admonition he is to be deprived of his pensions and of the administration of his benefice, and then after the third admonition he is to be wholly despoiled of his benefice; and finally he is to be excommunicated." Ligor. lib. 3, N. 442. I have examined the reference to the Council of Trent, and find it even so. "But be it observed," continues Ligori, "that a clergyman is not to be deprived of the income of his benefice, until *after sentence has been pronounced against him*."—Ibid. The "*Sententia ferenda*, or a sentence to be put in execution, is, however, a winking

Digitized by Google

according to law, at the crime: for when custom (a more sovereign law) permits, as in the West Indies, and in South America, the clergy keep concubines, even publicly, without molestation, as every person knows who has the slightest acquaintance with the priesthood of those countries. But in the nice tactics of Romanism there is the *Sententia ferenda* and the *Sententia lata.* The former denotes a sentence which the ecclesiastic Judge does not intend (*ipso facto,*) on the transgression, to be incurred, but one that *shall be* inflicted when he pleases to pronounce it. Hence a culprit may lay under this sentence half his life-time, and escape even a fine. The *Sententiu lata* is the sentence incurred in the fact of transgression, without waiting for the formality of execution. This is a part of the moral machinery of the canon law, to make way for casuistry and the winking at offences. Now the sentence against the clergy who keep concubines, is the *Sententia ferenda* (according to Ligori, Lib. 7, N. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12;) hence the prevalence of the custom where the public morals will endure it, as in Spanish America and the West Indies.

Have we not, then, seen that fines are imposed on those who keep concubines, after various admonitions, which, indeed, like angels' visits, are often short and far between; and those fines are to "build churches and other pious places." But what is the law concerning those who contract marriage? "*Siquis dixerit clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares castitatem solemniter professos, posse* matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto; anathema sit." So decrees the Council of Trent, Sess. 24, canon 9. See also Ligori, Lib. 5, N. 806. Which, in English, says, "If any one shall say that clergymen in holy orders, or monks who have solemnly bound themselves to chastity, can contract matrimony, and that when contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the law of the church to the contrary, let him be accursed."

This virgin priesthood is the Pandora's box of Romanism. Almost all sensible and moral Roman Catholics dislike or despise it. Erasmus, the most learned of the Roman Catholics at the era of the Reformation, says, "If any one consider the state of these times, how great a part of mankind the multitude of monks take up; how great a part the collection of priests and clergymen, and then consider how few out of so great a number truly preserve chastity of life, with how great scandal most of them are openly incestuous and incontinent, into what kind of lusts innumerable of them degenerate, he will perhaps conclude it were convenient that those who are not continent may have the freedom of public marriage, which they may purely and chastely, and without infamy, maintain." Ann. in Epist. ad Tim. C. 3.

So ends this chapter on Ligori, and with it our dissertations on this subject. Our authorities in the preceding debate are therefore insusceptible of invalidation from any charge or imputation which the Bishop of Cincinnati can allege against them, unsustained by better authority than his own; and that authority he cannot produce, as is evident from the fact that he has not attempted to do it.

A second topic, to which we can only at this moment cast a mere glance of the eye, is the repeated and abortive efforts of my learned antagonist to asperse my reputation for orthodoxy among Protestants; by his gleanings from the dregs of the sectarian press, which, contrary to every rule of decorum and good order, he thrust into the debate.

Digitized by Google

These extracts are the ravings of the humblest demagogues that ever opposed reformation from the days of Luther till now. The Bishop was, indeed, culpably ignorant of my views on any one subject in which I might differ from Episcopalians, Methodists, or Baptists. I find in all these communities, as well as in some others, excellent men with whom I fully harmonize in all cardinal points of religion; and regret that the spirit of the age is still too sectarian for all good Protestants to co-operate in those great measures essential for the triumph of Protestantism over popery, infidelity, and all opposing schemes. A farther reformation is needed, or, at least, a carrying fully out of the Protestant principles to the legitimate issue, as is confessed by all intelligent and pious Protestants. For that effort we plead, and this has incurred for us, as is usual in all such cases, an exuberance of reproach from a class who, if they have not much sense or piety, make much noise. Still, however, I allow not myself to dwell with emphasis on any subject that is not as catholic as Protestant Christendom.

I need not tell the reader that I never once retorted on my opponent in his own style, which, in this respect, I judged exceedingly low and undignified; nor did I seek to assail him on account of his private views, opinions, or character. The reason was, I opposed Roman Catholicism, and defended Protestantism. It was not a personal tilt, or rencounter, but a defence of principles and measures, so far at least as I was concerned. I did not appear against the man, Dr. Purcell, but against the political and religious despotism of Romanism, and for the civil and religious liberty of Protestantism. This was the issue; and I would not undignify it by a descent to that level, in which I might have provoked my too irritable friend even beyond the balance of his good nature, and a due respect to the standing of a prelate in the "Holy Mother Church." Besides, self-respect, without which a person knows not how to respect another, forbade an effort to degrade, in any wise, my opponent. In lowering his talents, his learning, or his general reputation, I should lower myself. For my own sake, then, I endeavored to sustain the reputation of my antagonist. And if I failed in so doing, the failure is not owing to my intention, or my efforts, but to the peculiarities of the case. I have, under this head, only to request the reader to learn my own views from what I have said on the preceding pages; and not from what my opponent has said, or may say of them. His gross ignorance of them renders him an incompetent witness; and therefore I enter my solemn protest against his representations of what he may please to call my peculiar sentiments.

Another point deserves a remark or two. In every instance in which I dwell upon, or criticise an expression, such as, "*I doubt not* but that these bad Popes are expiating their sins in the penal fires of hell;" or, "It is for this reason Protestants *hate* Catholics," &c. &c. I found it so in my notes, in my recollections, and in the report of my speeches tendered to me. If, then, my opponent has not always admitted these words, it must be explained by himself. I cannot disbelieve my eyes, my ears, or the testimony of many persons around me. I may not, indeed, have replied to much that he did say, because of its irrelevancy; but I have not, in any instance, replied to what he did not say.

But as my limits are very contracted, I must close with a brief synopsis of the points which were most emphatically sustained by me in the

Digitized by Google

aforesaid discussion. This becomes the more necessary because of the most egotistic, arrogant, and factless portrait of the discussion, published by the Bishop for the benefit of his *sheep* and *lambs*, to prevent them the necessity of both reading and thinking for themselves. The reader will please consider whether the following points have been sustained.

1. That there is no Pope in the Christian Institution; so far from it, that the name, title, and office are clearly and positively forbidden by Christ and his Apostles.

2. That there was no Pope or person claiming, and certainly no person possessing, universal headship as Prince of the Apostles, as Vicar of Christ, as head of the whole church, for almost six hundred years after Christ.

3. That Boniface *Third*, A. D. 606, was the first Pope that was ever acknowledged by Rome—and that he received that title and office by the hand of a prince who was a murderer and a usurper.

4. That the present Roman Catholic church began on the 16th day of July, 1054, and was them a schism from the Greek Catholic church.

5. That the Greek Catholic church was eight hundred years older than the Roman Catholic church, having begun in a schism headed by Cornelius, Bishop of the Roman diocese, A. D. 250.

6. That from A. D. 250, the true church began to suffer from the hand of a corrupt majority of professors, against whom she has continued to protest, as apostatizing and apostate, variously nicknamed by the worldly party from that day till now, though frequently covering as much territory and nearly as numerous as the party that imperiously called herself Catholic.

7. That the present church of Rome was not the mother of the Hebrew, Phenician, Syrian, Greek, or the ancient English, Scotch, Irish, or Welsh church; but is, herself, the daughter of the degenerate Greek church of the 11th century.

8. That the attribute of catholicity or the title of Catholic, is no where in the Holy Scriptures ascribed to the church of Christ; indeed, that the word *catholic* is not once found in the sacred writings of the Apostles.

9. That the first seven general ecclesiastic councils justly belong to the Greek Catholic church, and not to the Roman Catholic schism from that church.

10. That as neither the idea nor the name of a supreme visible human head over the church of Christ, is not found in the inspired scriptures, so neither is the idea of a succession of heads, or of universal bishops, and consequently that in the New Testament there is no law, rule, or direction concerning that succession.

11. That in the scriptures, and in the first 200 years after Christ, there is not one word intimating that Peter was ever bishop of Rome; but, on the contrary, there are found in the New Testament clear and explicit proofs that Peter lived and died an *Apostle*, and was never bishop of any particular see; and that he neither claimed, nor ever received from the other Apostles any official supremacy whatever.

12. That the first and only intimation of Peter having been Bishop of Rome, is found in a single tradition, mentioned *for the first time* in writing in a doubtful Latin version of a Greek author, named Ireneus, whose original works have been lost for ages; and this tradition is itself

Digitized by Google

incredible on his authority, because he is made to assert a positive falsehood in the same period—viz. that the church in Rome was planted by Peter and Paul; yet Paul writes his epistle to the church in Rome, whose fame was spread through the whole world before he ever saw Rome.

13. That there is no confidence whatever in the tabular views that are given of the succession of the first bishops of Rome.

14. That there have been twenty-nine schisms in the succession, or twenty-nine controversies about the true Pope.

15. That on one occasion there was no Pope in Rome for seventy years; and for almost half a century after, there were two lines of distinct rival Popes reigning at the same time: and on one occasion not less than three incumbents sitting together and squeezing each other in the old fisherman's chair, until they split it all to pieces.

16. That in the judgment of the most enlightened and virtuous Roman Catholics, there never was, take them all in all, a more wicked race of men than the Popes of Rome, from Gregory I. till now. So evident was this, in the discussion, that Bishop Purcell was constrained to say, that "some of these bad Popes were now expiating their sins in the penal fires of hell."

17. That inspiration is the only reason or cause of infallibillty, consequently that unless the whole church of Rome is inspired, she cannot be infallible.

18. That the church of Rome must be more fallible than the Protestant churches is evident, because her rule of faith is not inspired, and requires a general council to be always interpreting it; and in the absence of that council, every individual applicant to a priest is more in danger of error, than any Protestant sectary who reads the Bible.

19. That the Romanist has to adopt the Protestant principles in converting a Jew or a Pagan to his faith, or he has to reason in a vicious circle, first proving the Bible by the church, and then the church by the Bible.

20. That the many sects and parties in the bosom of the Roman church as little agree as the Protestant sects.

21. That the *Babylon* of John, the *man of sin* of Paul, and the *little horn* of Daniel, perfectly apply to the church of Rome, and to no other institution on earth.

22. That the Roman Catholic rule of faith and manners is immoral.

23. That her views of auricular confession, transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences, works of merit, &c. are anti-Christian, absurd, and injurious to society.

24. That we are independent of the Roman church for the Bible—so much so, that all Protestants reject her version of it as corrupt and incorrect.

25. That she is anti-American in her spirit, and aims, and objects, for she imposes on all the rulers of her church, eternal allegiance to the Popes of Rome, and under the severest anathemas, binds them forever to advance and increase their authority, and to persecute and destroy every other religious community.

26. That Romanists regard every thing against the utility and interest of their church, to be against truth and justice; and, therefore, that all oaths and covenants made with heretics, contrary to the interest

Digitized by Google

and prosperity of the church, are perjuries and to be broken rather than kept.

27. That the Roman sect is opposed to the reading of any English Bible, but the Douay, and that only by particular persons.

28. That all Protestant books or writings in favor of Protestantism, are prohibited the Catholic community by the Roman Pontiffs.

29. That also her persecuting decrees still remain unrepealed, and that the present Pope bewails the prevalence of liberal principles as unfavorable to that severity of discipline towards heretics, necessary to the prosperity and advancement of the church.

30. That the laws of the church, so late as Pius VI. still command the *extermination of heretics, the confiscation of their goods, and their deprivation of civil privileges, and regard free discussion and the liberty of the press as the greatest pests that can afflict society.*

31. That so long as the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent are of authority, the Roman Catholic Church must continue what she was at the era of the Protestant Reformation.

The Bishop and I agreed to have an Appendix, containing our respective reviews at the close of this volume. I prepared mine and sent it to the office. The Bishop having left their Reverences, Messrs. Montgomery and Collins, to attend to this affair; on his leaving the city these gentlemen thought proper to withdraw the Bishop's Appendix, and thus prevent me from appearing on several points which were reserved for it. They best know for what reason!!!

Having read all the proofs of this discussion up to this 368th page, on it, and on it only, do I certify, that the reader has substantially, as correctly, as under all the circumstances could have been expected, a fair representation of the whole discussion.

A. CAMPBELL.

March 7, 1837.

RAILING ACCUSATIONS.

We painfully learn that some of the zealous preachers of New-Schoolism, amongst whom is one Mr. *Parker*, have been, during the last winter, saying exceedingly hard things of our brethren and of the cause of reformation in Ohio. Now either the brethren are worthy of it, or they are not If they are worthy of it, then, as David said of Shimei when he both *stoned* and *cursed* him, "Let him alone and let him curse, for the Lord permits him " If they have railed against Mr. Parker or his people, let him, if he chooses, take the work of vengeance into his own hand, and render them railing for railing. But if the brethren are not worthy of it, and I am sure their cause is not, then it is their honor to suffer shame for the name of Christ; and in such a case I would rather say, 'Let him rail on,' than return to him one retaliatory word. Their duty is, by "doing well to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men;" and if good men are prejudiced against them, let them by their good behaviour show them that they are grievously mistaken. We have some *preaching* brethren and some *writing* brethren that have not been over-merciful in fault-finding, and who have said very hard and bitter things of their equals and superiors, however sweetly they may have felt on the occasion. They may, perhaps, deserve some castigation. But in such cases as the present it falls rather upon the innocent, as I presume, than upon the guilty. However, we have resolved to give no countenance to such procedures either amongst our brethren or aliens. The Book which contains our rule of

Digitized by Google

manners and good-breeding, says, "Bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." I dare say if Mr. Parker were acquainted with our views, aims, and efforts, he would sooner put his hand into the fire than revile us. But we have had brethren, and I fear still have, that would provoke Moses, if he were here, by the severity of their speech. They believe in healing the moral diseases of Christendom by *acids*, and *bitters*, and *blisters*, rather than by the milk, and honey, and wine of Christ's gospel. Ah! when shall the preacher of peace learn to "treat all men with respect"! How long before he learns that love and good-will are the only parents of love and good-will, and that he who would have the good wishes and the benedictions of good men, must show benevolence and good-will to all mankind. One weeping Jeremiah or one sympathizing Paul will effect more for the world and eternity than ten sarcastic cynics, or twice that number of ranting and railing buffoons, however pre-eminently accomplished in their profession. A. C.

ELDER HENLEY'S DEFENCE.

With pleasure we insert the following communication from *Elder Henley*, in justification of his course in relation to the new doctrines of the "Apostolic Advocate." I could not, indeed, easily bring myself to believe that any of our brethren, of mature age and reason in the Christian religion, could view these aberrations from the doctrine of the Bible in any other light than as suggested in the following letter:—

Guinea Bridges, *Caroline county*, April 18, 1837.

Beloved brother Campbell,

Being sixty miles from home, and confined to the room of a beloved sick son for the last three weeks, I sent my servant home to see how my family were, and to hear from my friends and brethren through our mails. He brought me your 3d number of the new series of the Harbinger. I this day read a part of it, and find your notice of the "Apostolic Advocate." My having acted as a friend to brother Thomas, and written some letters to him, *they being private*, and a letter published in the "Gospel Advocate" of Kentucky, upon reading your notice it becomes me to explain myself, and that through the Harbinger.

I have never agreed with brother Thomas in his speculations upon re-immersion, or the intermediate state, termed *materialism*. This he knows as well as any man. I have opposed his introducing the subject of re-immersion.

My having suffered so much, as you well know, from the proscriptive and intolerant spirit of some of the Baptist lordlings, it was natural for me to feel for any brother that maintained the character and spirit of a Christian. When I heard of the refusal of the clergyman who purchased up the press that the Advocate was

Digitized by Google

previously published on, and his objection to its being done so any longer; and a few days afterwards saw the piece of "Plain-Dealing" in the Gospel Advocate, I felt so indignant at such conduct that I gave full vent to my feelings in my letter to brethren Hall and Johnson. I trust no man, when he remembers I do not agree with brother Thomas in his *opinions*, will now ascribe to me any improper motive in expressing myself so freely. I acted under the influence of that unerring Spirit that says, "Love thinketh no evil"—"love covereth a multitude of sins"—"love never faileth" —to do good.

Brother Thomas came among us a stranger; and upon my acquaintance with him I was pleased with his talents and character, and wished him success in his labors, believing he possessed an independent spirit above the partisans of the day; and our being in want of men of talents and piety to assist us, we hesitated not to strengthen his hands. He has certainly taken a course very different from the majority of the brethren in Eastern Virginia. I know of no public teacher that approves of his views of re-immersion, or 'materialism,' but those he has re-immersed. I regret exceedingly that he has written upon a topic, calculated to do no good, in my judgment. I wrote him two or three *private* letters about the time of your using some expressions you subsequently apologized for, and mentioned that you had injured yourself, (not with me,) but some of your readers. I said the same things before I wrote him, to you, through brother Richardson, if I am not mistaken. I also regret he should have published these letters without first consulting me. On the 3d instant I wrote him a long letter complaining of his conduct towards you and the brethren. When I said he would be sustained in Old Virginia by us, it was added *so long as he maintains the character and spirit of a Christian*. I must say, I felt disappointed in him when I read his January number, about the first of this month. I find he has indulged in a spirit I do not approve; and his continuing this controversy about re-immersion and materialism, when he has denied he held any such sentiment, has mortified me very much.

Justice to myself, to you, and the cause I have espoused, demands that I should thus explain myself; and I hope you will permit me to do so through your Harbinger.

If brother Thomas should apologize for his conduct, and change or reform his *manner, spirit,* and the *subjects upon which he writes*, he will still find me the same friend I have always been. I am resolved to be no party-man in the Christian religion; I abhor all divisions for a difference of opinion, but condemn in myself upon conviction, any unchristian spirit, as well as in other men.

I am authorized by the co-operating churches to inquire of

Digitized by Google

you and the brethren generally, if we can get another Evangelist in Eastern Virginia. We want an active, pious, devoted man to the ancient gospel and order of things. Could we meet with one whose talents were such as to command the attention of the people, he would be provided for by us. Our brother Henshall, we trust, has done, and will do much good. The periodicals advocating this reformation, will please give the above information of our wants, and inform me, if they can, where we can be supplied, that I may open a correspondence with the brother.

Yours most affectionately,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

PUBLICATIONS.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER & REFORMER, or *A Voice from America;* containing Essays, Addresses, Orations, Letters, &c. &c.—by *Alexander Campbell and others.* Now first published in England by a congregation of New Testament Disciples, meeting for worship in Nottingham; who hold *one faith, one Lord, one immersion, &c.;* who will have fellowship with all immersed believers whose *behaviour* in the world is known to be consistent with their profession, and who like themselves desire to meet on the first day of the week, to attend to all that Christ has commanded, and thus to learn more perfectly the will of their heavenly Father, as revealed in his holy word.—"*Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.*"—"*Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail.*" —March, 1837.—LONDON: Published by Simpkin, Marshall and Co., Stationers' Hall Courts. and by the principal booksellers in Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Beverly, Leicester, New Castle upon-Tyne, Banbury, Huddersfield; and may be had by order of any bookseller.—Price four shillings per annum: 432 12mo. pages.

Such is the printed cover of the first number of a new work recently commenced in England, in the advocacy of primitive Christianity.

The following introductory remarks clearly display the views and intentions of the conductors of the "Christian Messenger." We intend to furnish them with an article for every month:—

"In March, 1835, a monthly periodical, entitled 'The Millennial Harbinger, and Voluntary Church Advocate,' was issued from the press, by Mr. W. Jones, of London. We were informed in the first number, that the leading object of that work would be to furnish the British public with authentic information respecting the state and progress of the gospel in America—that Mr. Campbell, who may be justly esteemed the ablest writer of the day, had transmitted to the Editor a copy of all his printed works, amounting to nearly twenty volumes, comprising a great variety of the *choicest*, most *elaborate*, and *elegant* essays on *theological* and other subjects, that are to be found in the English language; and that these essays would be communicated through the pages of the 'Millennial Harbinger.' For sixteen months this promise was fulfilled by the Editor, with great discrumination and credit to himself, and much edification to his readers. In the month of June, 1836, the public were informed that in consequence of a long and severe affliction, the infirmities attendant upon old age, and the Editor's great desire to accomplish other objects, which, in his estimation, were of paramount importance, the 'Harbinger' must from that month be discontinued. This announcement was received by many of his readers with mingled feelings of disappointment and grief, yet, at the same time, with resignation to the will of their heavenly Father, who doeth all things well. Since the above named period, the whole of Mr. Campbell's works, with some additional pamphlets by other learned and talented writers, who are advocating the cause of *Ecclesiastical Reform*, have been received by some brethren in Nottingham, and they for the last five months being engaged in examining their contents, and fully convinced that these Essays, &c. are eminently calculated to unfold the *meaning of the Scriptures*, to *enlarge the mind* of all *inquirers after truth*, to impart a *more perfect knowledge of God*, and the nature of *that kingdom which is not of this world;* and thus to be the means of *purifying* the hearts of all who *understand* and *believe* the gospel, have concluded, after much deliberation, to recommence their pub-

Digitized by Google

lication in this country, until the whole, which are not of a personal and local nature, are in circulation. It is calculated that they will make about *four volumes*, 432 pages each; and that the readers may form some idea what they are to expect, we shall briefly notice a few of the topics that will appear in the pages of THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER. Several Essays on the *Primitive State of Man*—on the *Patriarchal and Jewish Ages*—and more than two hundred *Essays, Addresses, Orations, and Letters on the Christian Character —Preacher—Experience—Worship—Order—Faith—Immersion····Prayer—Praise,—and the Lord's Supper.* Also, several *Essays on the Co-operation of Primitive Churches in spreading the Truth through the World; the Holy Scriptures, God's instrument in converting the World; the Second Coming of Christ; the History of Sin; the Millennium;* many *Letters* and direct *Appeals to Christians, Sceptics, Jews,* and *Infidels,* of every class.

"We shall give a *condensed view of the Evidences of Christianity,* as delivered by Mr. A. Campbell in his debate with Mr. Owen, the great champion of infidelity, &c.

"The Editors wish to be *distinctly understood,* that although it is their desire that the *principles* and *practices* advocated by Mr. Campbell and his able coadjutors should be freely expressed in this work, yet they are not to be considered *responsible* for them in *every particular;* nor would they, had they leisure from their present avocations, or talents equal to the task, enter into controversy with their brethren on these subjects; but earnestly desire that the readers will judge for themselves, and take the advice of an Apostle—'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.'——ED."

The contents of the first number, which reached us in five weeks from its publication in London, are as follows:—

1. Introduction. 2. John the Harbinger, or the Character of a Reformer. 3. Address to Christian Mothers. 4. Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things—No. IV. 5. Essay on the Work of the Holy Spirit in the Salvation of Men—No. I. 6. On Teaching Christianity—No. II. 7. God's Instrument of Instruction. 8. Extract from Milton's Treatise on Christian Doctrine.

APOSTOLIC DOCTRINES AND DUTIES, illustrated in a series of Sermons—By the author of the History of the Waldenses, Biblical Cyclopædia, Lectures on the Apocalypse, Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, &c. &c. &c. and Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.

This is the title of Elder Wm. Jones' forthcoming work, from the Prospectus of which we make an abstract:—

"To announce the publication of a volume of Sermons, and that at a time when the press may be said to groan under the weight of such productions, will no doubt appear to many a very absurd project, and such as requires that something be offered in the way of apology to secure the author from the charge of folly and presumption. And certainly were it any part of his design to enter into competition with our great masters of pulpit eloquence, either of the present or past generation, he thinks he should not be among the last to laugh at his own vanity; but his object and motives are happily altogether independent of what has now been mentioned, and will, he hopes, when explained, be found not wholly undeserving of regard.

"To him, then, it appears, and that after a long and somewhat intimate acquaintance with the professing world, that the style of preaching, now in vogue, bears little resemblance to that of the holy Apostles and first preachers of the gospel. The general run of sermons of the present day, he thinks, are little better than flimsy essays, in which finely rounded periods and elegant declamation are substituted for 'the weightier matters' of the apostolic doctrine concerning Jesus Christ and him crucified, together with the self-denying duties which natively arise out of that doctrine. This deplorable change in the style of preaching, he is inclined to attribute, in a great measure, to the influence of our academies, or colleges, in which Theology is taught as a science, and in which young men are trained up for the pulpit, so that he who acts his part best, or, in other words, who can make the most graceful speeches before an audience, and collect the largest congregation, is sure to be rewarded with the most liberal stipend It was not so, however, from the beginning. In the churches formed by the Apostles, and before Christianity became corrupted by the learning or wisdom of the schools, the church was the only seminary for educating young men for the elder's office or ministry of the word—there they exercised their gifts in the way of teaching, admonishing, or exhorting one another, 'speaking THE TRUTH in love'—and so contributing to the edification of the whole body. Thus they became 'mighty in the scriptures;' while, with us, the grand desideratum is to become accomplished scholars, or mighty in human learning.

"The writer is not unaware that in offering these remarks he lays himself open to the supercilious scorn of the academician, who will not fail to resolve them into motives of envy and spleen, perhaps reminding him of the fable of the fox and the grapes! But, if so, he is well content to sustain the obloquy. He cannot be greatly mortified by it, so long as he esteems it his privilege, and trusts he is in some measure thankful to that Sublime Being who so ordered his lot in life as to prevent his coming in contact with academies, or of being infected by their influence. Whatever may be the amount, whether less or more, to

Digitized by Google

which he has attained in the knowledge of the Christian doctrine and practices, he owes it to his connexion with the churches of Christ, and not to any school or college. With the former he has now been walking in fellowship nearly half a century, slowly indeed, acquiring knowledge and experience; and fully aware that the time cannot be far distant when he must 'put off this tabernacle,' it is his earnest wish to bequeath this volume of sermons as a legacy, and begs it may be viewed as a grateful memorial of the benefits he has derived from his intercourse among them. He would moreover humbly hope that it may not be wholly without its use to those young men among the churches who are heartily concerned about the interests of Zion, and who are more anxious to approve themselves unto their great Master in heaven, as workmen 'that need not be ashamed, *rightly dividing the word of truth*,' than to gain the applause of a giddy multitude. Let them remember that 'the fashion of this world passeth away'—while he who doeth the will of God abideth forever.

"The volume will comprise about 500 pages, handsomely printed with a new type and on fine paper, to match the author's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History; and will be put to press so soon as a sufficient number of subscribers offer themselves to indemnify the expenses of paper and print. ☞ Subscribers for six copies will be entitled to a seventh *gratis*.

"The following subjects are intended to be comprised in the volume:—The Apostolic Gospel and method of preaching it. The Death of Christ. The Attractive Influence of the Saviour's Death. The Truth, as it is in Jesus. The Vision on the Holy Mount. The Gospel Feast. The Calls and Invitations of the Gospel. The constraining Influence of the Love of Christ. The Christian Name and Character. The Law and the Testimony. Christ All and in All. The Resurrection of Christ, the ground of Hope. The Believer's Completeness in Christ. The Forgiveness of Sin. The setting up of Christ's Kingdom. The Word of Life, and how it must be held forth in the Churches," &c. &c. &c.

☞ Subscriptions to the above work will be received at this Office. A. C.

News from the Churches.

NOTTINGHAM, *England*, February 21st, 1837.

Dear Brother—My present object in writing to you is two-fold—viz. to inform you of what has taken place recently in Nottingham respecting the reformation; and to obtain from you further information in reference to this subject, and especially the progress made during the last year in America.

I would here mention that in the month of June I received from some brethren of the reformation in Philadelphia, meeting in Bank street, (and who, when in England, belonged to the Particular Baptists, and were personally known to me,) "The Tribute to the Memory of the Apostles," and the pamphlet entitled "Sin and its Cure;" the former of these, by the wish of some of my brethren, and as believing it calculated to do much good, I have had printed in this country; and am happy to state that out of 1500 copies which were struck off, 1000 were in circulation in less than three months!

In consequence of circulating this pamphlet, and the (as it were) silent effect of Mr. Jones' Millennial Harbinger and those works of yours which are known in this country, I have received letters of inquiry respecting the reformation which you and others have so successfully advocated in America, from 15 to 20 different places in England and Scotland. The seed which has already been sown appears like the leaven cast into the meal, and we hope the natural results will follow.

It is to you, brother Campbell, under the providence of a kind and gracious God, that myself and others in this place are indebted for a more clear and correct knowledge of that all-important truth which in

Digitized by Google

these days of darkness is kept so much out of view—viz. that the religion of Jesus is founded altogether upon *the knowledge and belief of facts*, instead of abstract influences and mystic operations upon the mind.

A beloved brother and his wife, (who were formerly members of the church in London with Mr. Ballantine,) myself, and 11 others, commenced on the 25th of December, 1836, a society on the principles of the reformation; and now after 8 weeks our number has increased to 40, 8 of whom have been immersed into Jesus for the remission of sins. I trust that we are all fully convinced that so long as human opinions are to be made the bond of union in the congregation of Messiah, there will of necessity be divisions among the disciples. We have, therefore, as far as possible in so short a time, laid aside the *isms* that are in existence—have given up all text-preaching and philosophising upon the word of God—and all clerical distinctions among the disciples of our Lord—and although we have much to learn and to *unlearn*, yet we have experienced a complete emancipation from all teachers except the *Son of God* and his *holy Apostles*, to whom it is our highest happiness, honor, and delight to be in a state of entire subjection. Our only denomination is "New Testament Disciples." Mr. Hine (the brother to whom allusion was before made) and myself were chosen by the body to preside at the meetings, and he to act as deacon also till persons scripturally qualified be raised up amongst us proper to fill the offices of bishops and deacons.

Believe me yours affectionately for the truth's sake, and in hope of a glorious immortality, J. WALLIS.

[May the Lord of the harvest raise up many reapers in Britain! and may the little band in Nottingham be multiplied a thousand times so many as they be, that the original gospel and institution of the Lord may run and be glorified in the length and breadth of the land of our forefathers, the land of Bibles—of free and benevolent institutions!!—A. C.]

TRUMBULL COUNTY, Ohio, April 13, 1837.

I have just ended an excursion of four weeks in this county. Some one of the brethren of the county was with me all the time. The churches, with little exception, are more than steadfast—they are laboring to purify themselves and to save others. There is a spirit manifested by most of the disciples now, much more salutary in its effects on community than what we have often seen. I think the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, fidelity, are abounding more. This is a happy improvement: may all the saints abound therein more and more! Eight were added during the trip—four by immersion—four that had previously obeyed. A. S. HAYDEN.

TUSCUMBIA, Ala. February 24, 1837.

The little family of our heavenly Father in this place, are growing gradually in the knowledge of his will—in brotherly kindness, and in love. On the last Lord's day they were all gladdened and made greatly to rejoice by an addition to their numbers of three, who had been saved according to the mercy of our God. Since writing to you last, five of the children of disobedience, who were dead in trespasses and sins, have been regenerated to the hope and filled with the joys of a new life, to which they have been raised to walk through faith in the strong working of God, who raised Christ Jesus from the dead—thanks be to the name of him who is highest, for the favor which he bestows on

Digitized by Google

us the least of all his saints, and who are not meet to be called *his;* but by *his* favor we are what we are: and may his name be praised—evermore praised! W. H. WHARTON.

[We have a number of such communications on hand, giving accounts of small additions and a gradual increase: nothing, however, very remarkable. In Cincinnati we learn the church still regularly increases: about one hundred have been immersed since the 1st of January and added to the church.——A. C.]

UNIVERSALISM.

It is more than one month since we sent duplicates of "Universalism, No. I." to Mr. Skinner; but we have neither seen our letter published in his paper, nor received as yet a reply in any form. A. C.

May 6, 1837.

POETRY.

From the Literary Souvenir.

YOUTH RENEWED.

Spring-flowers, Spring-birds, Spring-breezes
Are felt, and heard, and seen;
Light trembling transport seizes
My heart—with sighs between;
These old enchantments fill the mind
With scenes and seasons far behind:
Childhood, its smiles and tears,
Youth, with its flush of years,
Its morning clouds and dewy prime,
More exquisitely tinged by time.

Fancies again are springing,
Like May-flowers in the vales;
While long-lost hopes are singing
From thorns, like nightingales;
And kindly spirits stir my blood,
Like vernal airs that curl the flood:
There falls to manhood's lot
A joy which youth has not,
A dream more beautiful than truth—
Returning Spring, renewing Youth.

Thus sweetly to surrender
The present for the past,
In sprightly mood, yet tender,
Life's burden down to cast;—
This is to taste from stage to stage,
Youth on the lees refin'd by age;
Like wine well kept and long,
Heady, nor harsh, nor strong,
A richer, purer, mellower draught,
With every annual cup is quaff'd.

J. Montgomery.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER VI.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *June*, 1837.

SACRED TIMES.

CONTEMPLATED from a proper point, and through the lights of human history, the Jewish Institution, to the eye of intelligence, cannot fail to appear marvellously peculiar, unique, and extraordinary. Transfused through its whole essence, and deeply engraved upon its whole exterior, are numerous and striking indications of infinite benevolence and humanity, as well as of a Divine wisdom and understanding. The deep interest in man, and unfeigned respect for his proper dignity and happiness, no less than its singularly adumbrative and prophetic intimations, demonstrate its certain emanation from the Creator and moral Governor of the world. To originate from an old man, born some four centuries after the flood, many nations, amongst which was one significally different in almost every chapter and verse of its history from all other nations, and that for thousands of years, is astonishing enough; but to hide in that nation the germ of every human blessing, and to inspire its rites and usages with visions and revelations of eternal providence as connected with human destiny, so that the shadow of every substantive existence of future good should precede its development, is unquestionably miraculous and Divine.

At present we confine our reflections to its sacred times, as connected with human redemption. In the first place, then, it ought to be noted in general terms that every week had a *Sabbath*—every moon, a *feast*—and every year, three splendid *anniversaries*.

Tisri, the first month of the civil year, but the *seventh* of the sacred or ecclesiastic year, commenced with the FEAST OF TRUMPETS: so that the new year was always introduced by sound of trumpet, echoing from hill to valley, from Dan even to Beersheba; congratulating every Israelite

Digitized by Google

on the joyful occasion, and carrying to his dwelling the benedictions of a whole nation, and their kind wishes that the new year might be to him a year of peace, joy, and prosperity.

This day was distinguished not merely by a solemn and joyful convocation, but by offerings peculiar to itself. Of these there were a burnt-offering, a meat-offering, and a sin-offering, in addition to the ordinary offerings for other new moons and for every day in the year.* And in after times, to give more solemnity and joy to the occasion, the 81st Psalm was chanted in every dwelling; when, from the doors of the Temple, the two silver trumpets announced the appearance of the new moon, aided by myriads of rams' horns, which carried the sympathy to every inhabitant of the Holy Land.

The psalm seems to have been written for the occasion. It begins with these appropriate words:—"Sing aloud to God our strength; make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob. Take a psalm and bring hither the timbrel, the pleasant harp with the psaltery. Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast-day. For this is a statute of Israel, a law of the God of Jacob. This he ordained in Joseph for a testimony when he went out through the land of Egypt, when I heard a language that I understood not," &c. &c. Thus the civil year was introduced by the feast of trumpets.

The ecclesiastic year, which commenced in Nisan, at the time, or near the time of the vernal equinox, seems to have been ordained with special reference to religious solemnities. On the 14th day of the first month was the PASSOVER; on the 15th commenced the FEAST OF UNLEAVENED BREAD, which continued for seven days; then in the third month, fifty days from the Passover, was the FEAST OF WEEKS, or the Pentecost, which was arranged to commemorate the giving of the law on Sinai, as well as to acknowledge the kind providence of God in the seasons, by *waving* in the air a loaf, the first fruits of the wheat harvest. On the 15th day of the seventh month was the feast of INGATHERING, at the close of the vintage and wheat harvest; more usually called the FEAST OF TABERNACLES, because Israel dwelt in *booths* for one week, in commemoration of their sojourning forty years in the wilderness. This feast also continued seven days. These three great annual national festivals occupied in all sixteen days, besides the time of coming and going and the other necessary preparations for the services. There was also the fast of the 10th of the seventh month, the great national expiation or atonement. The feast of Purim, or the Lots, in the twelfth month, in commemoration of a great national salvation by Esther, from the intrigue and knavery of Haman, was also superadded. This feast continued three days.

* Numbers xxix. 1—6.

Digitized by Google

Now, if we allow only thirty days for the Passover, the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Pentecostian Festival, the Feast of Tabernacles, the National Expiation, and the Feast of Purim, which would be a reasonable allowance, then, including the twelve New Moon Festivals and fifty-two Sabbaths, we find no less than ninety-four days in every year consecrated to religious improvement.

Still this is not a full view of the whole provision for moral culture amongst this peculiar people, even as respects *time*. There was a morning and there was an evening sacrifice for every day in the year. These seasons were sacred to devotion, and demanded about *one-twelfth part* of the day. And, superadded to all this, every seventh was a Sabbatical year, a year of rest to the land and to the people. The seventh year was a prolonged Sabbath, affording the happiest season for social enjoyment and moral improvement. Thus when we subtract ninety-four days from the year, and one-twelfth and one-seventh of the remainder, we find that God mercifully gave his ancient people more than an average of one hundred and fifty-five days per annum for moral and religious instruction and improvement. To this might be added the free-will offerings of time, for private and personal devotion, which would, amongst the more religious portions of the community, fully make out about *half the year!* From these premises may it not be safely affirmed that a pious Jew devoted one half his time to intellectual and religious culture and enjoyment, as respected himself, family, and society? What an admonition this appropriation of Jewish time to those Christians whose constant apology for want of personal and family improvement, is,—"We have not time." Is the Lord less gracious to Christians than to Jews? or are we more enslaved to time and sense than even Israel according to the flesh?

But to complete a full age and to perfect that system, there was moreover the consecration of the *fiftieth year*. As after seven Sabbatical weeks came the Pentecost, or the feast of weeks, the first fruits of the season, on the *fiftieth day;* so, after seven Sabbatical years, came the Jubilee, the *fiftieth year*, sacred to the restoration of inheritances, the free discharge of all debtors, and general emancipation.* The land it seems had rest also during this year, or so much of it as ran out into the ecclesiastic year; for it was upon the *tenth day* of the *seventh month* of the sacred year, but the *first* month of the civil year, that the Jubilee trumpets were heard throughout the land. The time when the proclamation of release was made was the most appropriate imaginable. After the most solemn fast and penances of the day of annual redemption and

* Not *universal;* for only Hebrews, Israelites by birth or proselytism, partook of the blessings of that day; typical, no doubt, that none but the true Israel of God can share the eternal redemption when the day of final release shall come.

Digitized by Google

reconciliation, when a full expiation of the sins of the year was accomplished, and every true Israelite experienced the sweets of forgiveness, it was divinely ordained that immediately after the benedictions of that day a full discharge of all debts—a remission of all penalties—a release from personal bondage and servitude—a plenary restoration of all family inheritances, should be proclaimed by sound of trumpet from the gates of the Temple to the humblest dwelling in all the precincts of the twelve tribes.

The sound of this trumpet, like that of the archangel, was to be heard by every ear in all the land of Judea. It was indeed a joyful sound only to those who anxiously waited for it. But to them no sound was more transportingly joyful. To have witnessed such a scene, which, however, generally occurred but once in the active and observant lifetime of an Israelite, must have been superlatively interesting. To describe the varied expressions of gladness beaming from eye to eye, while the unfortunate bankrupt received by a single blast of the trumpet of God's appointment a full discharge from all his obligations—the servant sold for debt, an immediate emancipation from his master—and the various unfortunates, long exiled from their paternal homes and fields, a welcome to those delectable scenes of former years, the scenes of a thousand pleasing associations;—I say, to describe in suitable style such scenes, were for him who actually saw, and much more for us who can only imagine them, wholly impossible. We shall not, therefore, attempt it.

But, seeing in this most wise and humane institution, a strong and vivid reference to the acceptable year of the Lord, the gospel day of grace; we think it expedient, because greatly instructive, to consider not only the Jubilee institution, but the figurative redemption which accompanied, or rather preceded it in the adumbrations, types, and figures of the antecedent economy. It requires time, much time, as the large appropriations already noted clearly show, to understand all these sublime matters fully; and therefore we shall consider, and give our readers time to consider, the scriptural doctrine of *redemption* till another moon.

A. C.

BIGOTRY.

The power of language over mind is universally acknowledged. The excitement of speech on the excitability of the human soul has not, however, been as yet duly estimated or graduated to the understanding of even philosophers themselves. Words fitly

Digitized by Google

spoken, we all see, have an indescribable power, not only in awaking thought in producing ideas, but in stirring up the emotions and sentiments, in rousing the sympathies and the antipathies of the heart, according to the will of the skilful orator. Some persons there are who are so intelligent on this subject, and so well acquainted with themselves and with the acknowledged powers of others, that they are not only afraid to trust their wards, but even themselves in their hands, upon any question in which they are much interested.

But, distinct and diverse from this general and legitimate influence of speech, there is a species of imposture, of usurpation, and even of tyranny, practised by means of a factitious value and influence attached to certain words of well-established currency and character. Words, like persons and things, sometimes deservedly and sometimes undeservedly obtain a good and a bad fame, which they occasionally survive, and which, while in fashion, like a talisman, exert a magical influence on society. But that species of imposture and tyranny to which we would direct the attention of our readers, is most frequently effected by the misappropriation of words of good or bad fame, to persons and things to which they do not justly belong. The knave and the demagogue, observing that the thoughtless multitude are often captivated by the charm of some popular epithet, or roused to indignation or rage by the fatal spell of some ill-omened noun-substantive, or adjective, soon machinates a scheme of deception by the misapplication of these reputable or disreputable terms and phrases according to the passion of his country and contemporaries, and his own immediate wishes and ends. Fortunes have been made, and sceptres and crowns have been won by the charms of the popular phrases "national glory," "national right," "true patriotism," "interest of the commonwealth," "rights of the people," &c. And in our own country we know the magic sway of "Whig" and "Tory," of "Federalism" and "Republicanism," of "National Republicans," "the Spirits of '76," "the rights of the sovereign people," "the liberty of the Press," "freedom of speech," &c. &c. A man's rising or falling in the state depends upon his tact in using this modern coin *judiciously*—that is, *deceptiously*, as many would interpret the word.

Digitized by Google

In the religious department, for neither is *it* exempt from the spirit of imposture, we know what honors have been lost and won by the words "orthodox," "heterodox," "heretic," "heresy," "doctrines of grace," "divine influence," "religion of the heart," speculative faith," "historic belief," "latitudinarianism," "sectarianism," &c. &c.

True, indeed, the same terms at one time and in one country are as acceptable as the most delicious odors from the islands of perennial bloom; at another time and in another state of society, they are as unwelcome as the Sirocco of Syria, or the Simoom of the desert. In this age and country the phrases "rights of man," "liberty of speech and of the press," "republican equality," "civil and religious liberty," "freedom of conscience," &c. fall upon our ears sweet as the sound of the dulcimer; while in Rome or in St. Petersburg they are as dissonant and odious as the croaking of the frogs or the ditty of the locusts in an Egyptian parlor.

It is remarkable what charms have recently clustered around the phrases "liberal Christian," "catholic spirit," "Christian charity," "benevolent enterprize," "enlarged views," &c.; and what accumulated ire and unmingled reprobation have fallen upon the "contracted bigot," the "illiberal sectary," the "narrow-minded Christian," the "dogmatist," the "fierce zealot," the "ardent controversialist," the "uncharitable partizan," &c. Not presuming to stem such a current, or rather torrent, which bids defiance to our puny efforts, we shall only moot the question, *May not good and lovely things be called by bad and hateful names, and thus the odium and aversion due to the name be transferred to the thing?* Is there, then, indeed, no danger of imposition or fraud, religious or political, being practised upon the community in this way? and if so, how may it be most successfully encountered? are very grave and important questions, and should be considered by every one for himself.

We are constrained to think that perhaps a very undesigned system of deception may be carried on by the talismanic influence of the phrases "*liberal Christianity*" and "*downright bigotry.*" Liberal Christianity, it is true, is not easily defined; and especially since the conflagration of the Patent Office, it is im-

Digitized by Google

possible to decide which of the two chief claimants for this species of Christianity, I mean the Universalists or the Unitarians, have the best legal and accredited rights. One thing is indeed most evident, that they reproach all other professors as greatly sinning against their standard of liberal Christianity, and speak as if they had some well-defined rights to the exclusive appropriation of "enlarged views," of "genuine charity," and of "a liberal gospel;" while the rest of us are narrow, contracted, illiberal sectaries!

I could indeed wish that these two classes had an indisputable right to the designation of "liberal Christians;" so much so, at least, as to intimidate any new aspirants after such philosophic honors. But it is with regret I discern some indications of a new jealousy arising from some Neologists; or, at least, a sort of hankering after the honorable and high reputation of a "truly liberal and catholic Christianity." For my part, to be a Christian —a naked Christian, without a single epithet, is just the highest honor to which I can rationally wish to attain. I will give all the epithets *liberal, philosophic, rational, charitable, catholic,* applied to the noun substantive, *Christian,* for the thing itself. They may have all the *adjectives* if they will only permit me to enjoy the *substantive.* The "almost Christian," and the "catholic, liberal, high-minded Christian" are something more or less than *the Christian*; and are, therefore, uncanonical, unscriptural, and of no account in the kingdom of heaven.

In liberalizing Christianity the process is very different from that of sectarianizing it. In the former case the operator, in analytic style, is constantly decomposing and generalizing; while in the latter case, in the synthetic manner, he is always individualizing and forming new classes. The liberalizer is in pursuit of generic truths, while the sectarianizer is in quest of specific peculiarities. The liberalist classifies all the generalities under their generic heads, while the anti-liberalist classifies the particularities under the specific congruities of a single category.

The Gnostic advocates some sweeping generality as the standard of perfection, and forms a brotherhood around his philosophic notion of light, of life, or of love; while the bigot counts up his beads, and enumerates his ceremonies to the very hem of a sur-

Digitized by Google

plice, or to the central peak of a triangular cap. Both are diseased minds: the former may be a *mono-maniac*, and the latter a *multo-maniac;* or the one may be a *partialist* and the other a *totalist:* but neither of them have the *sano mens in sano corpore*, the sound mind in the sound body, as respects the doctrine, spirit, or behaviour of Christ's religion.

But I am more afraid of the potency of the word *bigotry* than of the word *liberality;* for while a few only are charmed and fascinated by some beautiful and popular term, all are averse to the odium and reproach of some defamatory and disgraceful epithet or association. Many there be who will not aspire to the honors of a liberal Christianity, who will, however, shrug up their shoulders and turn away their ears from any thing that is called bigotry or illiberality. The Devil himself would prefer to be a liberalist rather than a bigot.

Now, as liberality goes in the year 1837, it claims the license of adjusting not only the rules of interpretation, but also of denouncing so many of the particular observances and duties, and even ordinances of the New Institution, as would seem to conflict in the least with that wide and magnanimous and very catholic religion which embraces all who subscribe to some two or three generalities—such as "*God is love*," "*God is one*," and "*grace is free;*" like the Mussulman, who disdains both Ali and Omar, and is content simply to say, "There is one God, and Mahomet is his Prophet."

Conscientiousness is now-a-days becoming unfashionable, because it is very generally denominated bigotry; and under that designation it is easily calumniated out of countenance. If a person should think, or profess, or teach that a special and very particular attention to all God's commandments and ordinances is requisite, not indeed to make a good, or a liberal, or a charitable Christian, but simply *a Christian*, in the current style of the apostolic age, he is in danger of being immediately baptized into bigotry, and his conscientiousness of being regarded as ignorance and imbecility.

True, indeed, in my nomenclature a liberal-minded man is greatly preferable to a bigot; but a liberal man is not one of licentious, or even of enlarged opinions and views; but a man of a

Digitized by Google

generous and benevolent heart, whose liberality appears much more in his hands than in his head—in his purse, than in his lips—in devising liberal schemes, rather than in hatching new and splendid theories. With me a bigot is a mere partizan; one who goes for the regimentals—for the mere stripes of blue, of white, or of scarlet, which designate the regiment in which he parades; not so much one who tithes mint, anise, and dill, as one who goes for his party, right or wrong—and goes for it to a button or a pin. He is, indeed, no more conscientious than the liberalist; but he is more enslaved to the caprices and usages of some little spirit like himself, who has ingeniously contrived a spider's theory for holding insects still weaker than himself.

But, with many, he who believes in *one* baptism is a bigot; while he who believes in *three* is a liberal and charitable and catholic Christian. He who believes that all shall be saved, without regard to present character or behaviour, is a liberal and truly charitable Christian; while he who contends that "the ungodly shall perish," and that "sinners shall be destroyed," is an illiberal sectary. And he who makes faith in one God and in one Mediator, who was merely a prophet and a martyr, and the excellency of virtue its strongest plea, and its chief reward the sole bond of union, is an honorable and liberal Christian; while he who contends for the dignity of the Saviour in order to the efficacy of his death as a sin-offering, is a contracted bigot—a weak and illiberal Christian!

A conscientious man, who trembles at the word of God, who is intent on knowing and doing his Master's will; who, while he would tithe mint, anise, and cummin, is mindful of the weightier matters of the law, justice, fidelity, and the love of God, is any thing but a bigot. He is not blindly attached to men's opinions, or to the traditions of the Fathers. His conscience only feels the authority of the Supreme Lawgiver, and bows without cavilling or reservation to the humblest as well as to the most imposing requisition of his Redeemer. If men and principles must be separated, he goes for the latter at the risk of the former.

Those who have the popular notions of bigotry and liberality, had better inquire whether Paul was not a very great bigot when he said, "Verily, I say to you, if you be circumcised Christ shall

Digitized by Google

profit you nothing;" and James, when he said, "If a man should keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all;" and John the Apostle, who said, "If a man say, I know him, and keep not his commandments, he is a liar and the truth is not in him;" and the Saviour himself, who taught, "If you believe not that I am the Messiah, you shall die in your sins;" and, "Whither I go you cannot come"—"Unless you repent you shall likewise perish"—and, "Unless your righteousness exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Were we at all inclined to use the term *liberal* in reference to the Christian profession, we should take the position that *the most enlightened and enlarged Christian will ever be the most conscientiously minute in keeping the least as well as the greatest of the commands of his Master*; and while he will allow perfect freedom of discussion, and liberty of opinion in all matters purely speculative, he will be most scrupulously exact in doing honor to the authority of his Master, by doing every thing commanded, and in the manner in which he is commanded; because the God whom he worships under every dispensation of his will, has paid as much attention to the *manner* as to the *matter* of all religious observances, and has ever honored them that honored him, so far as they have obeyed from the heart that mould of doctrine, which, for their holiness and happiness, he was graciously pleased to establish and ordain. A. C.

Prophetic Department.

THE PROPHECIES—*NO. V.*

THE PROPHECY OF BALAAM.

In the deep and manifold wisdom and goodness of God, he has employed agents of various kinds and characters in accomplishing his admirable plans of Providence and Redemption. He has not only employed Angels, Prophets, and Apostles, who were reconciled to his government; but even those who were in heart and purpose opposed to his cause and his people. Balaam, Saul, Nebuchadnezzar, Judas, and

Digitized by Google

others of less fame were employed in some of the great occasions of prophetic and divine communications to mankind. The evidence is, therefore, not one-sided. It is not *ex-parte* either in history or prophecy; and certainly out of the mouth not only of two or three witnesses, but of two or three kinds and characters of witnesses, every word shall be well established. Without farther preamble, we proceed to the particular prophecies of Balaam.

The scene and occasion of these prophecies were as follows:—

1. Israel had encamped on the plains of Moab, on this side the Jordan, not far from Jericho. Balak at that time was king of Moab, and had learned all that Israel had done to the Amorites; therefore he and his people were panic-stricken when this mighty and numerous people appeared on his borders.

2. In those days there was a celebrated prophet who lived in Mesopotamia, not far from the Euphrates, the son of Beor, whose name was Balaam. He, as well as many others in those days, had the knowledge and the worship of the true God, though greatly corrupted by tradition. There was Jethro in Midian, Job in Arabia, as well as Balaam of Pethor in the country of Abraham, and Abimelech in Egypt, who, as well as the family of Abraham, had the knowledge of the God of the whole earth.

3. The fame of this prophet and his alleged skill in divination, or his power with God, had spread all over the East, insomuch that the son of Zippor prince of Moab, sent for him to come and curse his enemies, or doom them to destruction, as the Pagans on going to war in ancient times were wont to do to their enemies.

4. Having been induced by rewards and promises, he appears by the permission of God amongst the enemies of his people: but, in despite of his wishes, he is constrained to bless the sons of Jacob. His first prediction, by the immediate impulse of the Spirit, is a clear prophecy, and is expressed in the following words:—"And he took up his parable, and said, Balak the king of Moab hath brought me from Aram, out of the mountains of the east, saying, Come, curse me Jacob, and come, defy Israel. How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied? For from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him: lo! the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations. Who can count the dust of Jacob, and the number of the fourth part of Israel? Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!"*

The point peculiar in this prediction is, "*Lo! the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.*" A purer or more

* Numbers xxiii. 7—10.

Digitized by Google

unequivocally inspired oracle than this, never was spoken. This great conjurer of the east opened his mouth to curse Israel, but the Spirit of God commanded his tongue and his lips, and he spake a true prophecy, a divine oracle. He spake as unquestionably by a supernatural impulse as did his ass that carried him to the camp of Israel, when it reproved the madness of the prophet. The witch of Endor was not more disappointed when Samuel stood before her, whom God unexpectedly called from the grave, while, in the style of her own necromancy, she was powwowing over the grass, and practising her idle enchantments at the command of another forsaken king. Balaam and the Madam of Endor had each a king in attendance, while for the wages of unrighteousness they were using their own conjurations. But God astonished them both and the attending sovereigns, for "he taketh the wise in their own craftiness," and "frustrateth the tokens of the liars and maketh diviners mad: he turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish."

Three thousand three hundred and thirty years have proved the truth of what Balaam spoke; for Israel has dwelt alone, a separated and a peculiar people, from that day till now. They have not yet been absorbed, like all their ancient contemporaries, by the revolutions and changes of all the other dynasties of the world. Still they float upon the surface of time and of nations, while Moab, and Ammon, and ancient Egypt, and the empires of the east have sunk, like Pharaoh, to the bottom of the sea of national oblivion. What a singular telescope was suddenly placed before the eye of the prophet, while he was surveying the fourth part, or one of the squares of the camp of Israel, by which he was enabled to trace their history for more than half the age of the world—for more than half the length of the whole flight of time; and thus to see the nation always singular, always peculiar, and under the wings of a special providence!!

When he said, "Let my last end be like Israel's," or like the righteous people, he speaks of the blessings of the latter day, and foretells the future glories that await this peculiar and most interesting people. Having the first part of his prediction so fully verified, who can doubt but the dispersed remnants of Israel, yet dwelling alone in the midst of many nations, shall once more astonish all nations and be the glory of the whole earth—as peculiarly singular in glory as have been all the other peculiarities of their varied and greatly interesting fortunes.

Such was the first prophecy of Balaam, delivered from the high places of Baal. We shall next listen to his predictions from the top of Mount Pisgah:—"God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he

Digitized by Google

spoken, and shall he not make it good? Behold, I have received commandment to bless, and he hath blessed; and I cannot reverse it. He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel: the Lord his God is with him, and the shout of a king is among them. God brought them out of Egypt: he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn. Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel: according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought? Behold, the people shall rise up as a great lion, and lift up himself as a young lion: he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey, and drink the blood of the slain."* The only point in this prediction on which we pause, is this singular saying, "According to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought?" And at this time who can read the history of the Jews and not say, as Balaam said it should be always said of that people, "*What hath God wrought?*" Like the burning bush unconsumed, Israel often cast down has not yet been, and never shall be, destroyed.

But the predictions from Mount Peor are the most worthy of our attention:—"And Balaam lift up his eyes, and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the Spirit of God came upon him. And he took up his parable, and said, Balaam the son of Beor hath said, and the man whose eyes are open hath said; he hath said, which heard the words of God, which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open: How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! as the vallies are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign-aloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside the waters. He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters, and his king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted. God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn: he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows. He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion: who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee."†

Again—"And he took up his parable, and said, Balaam the son of Beor hath said, and the man whose eyes are open hath said; he hath said, which heard the words of God, and knew the knowledge of the Most High, which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open: I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold

* Num. xxiii. 19—24. † Num. xxiv. 2—9.

Digitized by Google

him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city. And when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek was the first of the nations; but his latter end shall be, that he perish for ever. And he looked on the Kenites, and took up his parable, and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in the rock. Nevertheless the Kenite shall be wasted until Asshur shall carry thee away captive. And he took up his parable, and said, Alas, who shall live when God doeth this! And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever."*

Here we have Judah's Lion, Jacob's Star, Israel's Sceptre, and the victorious Prince whose wide dominions encompass all nations, clearly and distinctly announced, besides the general fortunes of the Jews and other empires of antiquity. Concerning the Messiah, the particulars are:—

1. His coming was then long future: "I shall see him, but not *now;* I shall behold him, but not *nigh.*" Balaam, in looking over the camp of Israel, saw him not then among them, but to rise from them.

2. He is described as the *Star* of Jacob—as the *Sceptre* of Israel; emblems of glory and power. This faintly refers to David first, and then to David's Son: for David (2 Sam. viii. 2.) subdued Moab, measured them by a line, prostrated them to the ground, and made them tributary to his government. In like manner he subdued Edom, (2 Sam. viii. 14.) But the children of Seth, from whom Moab and all the human race now existing sprang, will only be subdued by David's Son; who,

3. "Out of Jacob shall come, having dominion, and shall subdue him that remaineth of the city." The triumphant and extensive conquests of all nations by the Sword of the Spirit, the Sceptre of Grace, or by the iron rod of avenging wrath, is clearly foretold in these oracles of the Spirit, as certainly as God in Nebuchadnezzar's vision foreshowed the destinies of the ancient empires and the ultimate sway of Messiah's kingdom.

4. The doom of Amalek is foretold with historic plainness. It was the first of the nations, (that warred against Israel, as the scene and context supplies,) and its latter end shall be an entire destruction.

* Num. xxiv. 15—25.

Digitized by Google

Saul, David, and the sons of Simeon in the days of Hezekiah left not a remnant of Amalek.*

5. And still more remarkable, the gradual decay of the Kenites till the Babylonish captivity was ended, is next mentioned with singular perspicuity: "The Kenites shall be wasted until Asshur [Assyria, Chaldea, Babylon,] shall carry thee [O Israel] away captive." The Kenites, it would seem, were carried away with the ten tribes, or with the Jews into Babylon; for the Kenites are mentioned as being yet among the Jews after the captivity, 1 Chron. ii. 55. This is the first time the Assyrian captivity is mentioned, and with as much clearness as the coming of the Messiah. But the fates of Assyria itself are next described: for,

6. "Ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur and Eber, and he also shall perish for ever." By "Chittim" the Greeks under Alexander, or the Greeks and Romans, are specially referred to: for Chittim was a son of Javan, whose posterity settled in Macedonia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and Italy. The Greek and Roman conquest of the Chaldean Empire is here fully intimated. As for *Eber* or *Abar*, the people east of the Euphrates, they too perished by the Greeks and Romans in their conquests of the Chaldean and Medo-Persian Empires. But the ruin of Chittim is also foretold: "He also [Greeks or Romans] shall perish forever."

How much sacred history—rather, how much of the fortunes of Israel, Amalek, the Kenites, the Assyrians, Grecians, Romans, and the eastern nations is sketched in a few words by the Omniscient Spirit that commanded the tongue of the mercenary Balaam!

But why are the fortunes of Amalek, Moab, Edom, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, all grouped by Balaam in this last oracle?—That he might leave Israel, the Star of Jacob, the Sceptre of Israel, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, He that was to come and have dominion, in the peaceful and triumphant possession of all the human race, and of all the riches and glory of the earth. This prophecy of Balaam is indeed one of the most comprehensive, luminous, and splendid in holy writ. Like the wicked Caiaphas, he said more in a period than could be explained in a thousand volumes. It deserves, and we will yet pay this precious document more attention. A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

EDUCATION.

The following extemporaneous remarks, tendered at the close of the late very interesting examination of the Female Seminary in Steuben-

* 1 Sam. xv. 1—8. 1 Sam. xxviii. 8. 1 Chron. iv. 41—43.

Digitized by Google

ville, Ohio, under the superintendance of Mr. and Mrs. BEATTY of the Presbyterian church, were afterwards unexpectedly solicited for publication. As they perchance may be of some use to some of our readers, we copy them from the "Western Herald," in which they first appeared.

A. C.

The friends of female education are referred to the remarks in our preceding columns, made by Judge Leavitt and by Rev. A. Campbell, at the late examination of the pupils in the Steubenville Female Seminary. To those remarks we have nothing to add, except barely to express the hope that they may be read with the same satisfaction with which they were received when delivered. They came from both the gentlemen extemporaneously, and are, we believe, faithfully reported.

W. Herald, April 19.

"Unexpectedly called upon, at this moment, to address this highly respectable and intelligent audience, on the interesting incidents of the day, I am sorry that I cannot do justice to my own views of the subject before me—to the proficiency of the young ladies, nor to the merits of the institution, in the few extemporaneous remarks which I am now to offer. True, indeed, I can express my cordial concurrence in the opinions and views of the learned gentleman who has just preceded me; and this is, perhaps, the best thing I can say on this occasion. I am not much accustomed to bestow flattering compliments; but I trust I may be indulged, without suspicion of such design, to say, that I have not, before the present examination, witnessed, in any Female Seminary, and in very few of the Seminaries for young gentlemen, so near an approach to that course of education which I had some years since settled in my own mind, as the rational and proper standard, so far as the happy combination of intellectual and moral culture is to be secured. And, may I add, it afforded me the highest pleasure to see my fellow-citizens awakening in every corner of the land to the consideration of this most important concern.

Education, with me, is the proper development and direction of the human powers. It is not merely the simple communication of the knowledge of letters—of the names of things—of the rules of art, or of the outlines of the whole circle of science. It is the proper training, the full development and cultivation of the physical, intellectual, and moral faculties. It is teaching a person to think, to reason, to act for himself, and from himself, in harmony with the constitution of the universe; or in unison with himself and with all the relations in which he stands to God and man—to things past, present, and future. Such is a rational and a moral education. I was, therefore, delighted to observe, that the attention of the young ladies in this Seminary is happily turned to the proper subjects—that the course of education here introduced,

Digitized by Google

and so successfully carried out, contemplates *woman* as well man, as a physical, intellectual, and moral being; and, therefore, those sciences are here carefully taught, which make the student acquainted with herself, as well as with the things around her. This is as it should be. I do not mean that physiology and anatomy, in all their details, are proper subjects of general study; but that there is an acquaintance with these sciences, a certain amount of knowledge in these departments of study, much more valuable and useful to man and woman, than an acquaintance with the dead languages, or abstract philosophy; for with me *utility* in education is the first and paramount interest. If, hitherto, I had had any doubts that young ladies, any less than young gentlemen, are capable of the highest proficiency in every branch of the philosophy of matter and mind, those doubts should have, this day, been fully dissipated. But I have had no doubts on this subject, only place them under a proper system of education.

Great errors have, till lately, very generally obtained on this subject. Not long since, in some moth-eaten volume, perhaps not more ancient than the reign of Queen Elizabeth, I saw it gravely debated whether young women should be taught to write; pretty much for the same reason, too, why we Virginians will not allow our slaves to be educated—lest they should hold unlawful correspondence; for it was seriously alleged, that if young ladies were taught to write, it would be impossible for their parents to exercise the necessary guardianship over them. They might, forsooth, compound with the gentlemen, and clandestinely enter into matrimonial engagements, without the knowledge and consent of their parents—an offence at all times to be reprobated. And, indeed, till within a few years, the opinion was very general, that any sort of education was sufficient for girls. They were not expected to figure, nor shine, nor to hold office in society; and, therefore, if they could read, write, and *cypher* a little, they were fully accomplished for all the duties and business of their station in life. This idea is, perhaps, not yet fully discarded, though it be full time it were universally repudiated. For my part, I may be thought an enthusiast, or to go to an extreme on the other side; but, be this as it may, I will hazard the declaration, that if the question rested on my vote, *whether, as a general rule, the female sex, or the male sex, ought to be better educated*, as a philanthropist I would say, The ladies should have it. And if any one asks me, Why? I would answer, Because posterity always depends for its mental and moral character incomparably more upon the mothers than upon the fathers of the existing generation. But I go for equality as far as circumstances will permit, especially in those sciences that more

Digitized by Google

immediately develope the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of the pupil.

On the subject of moral culture, it is uniformly agreed, among all persons of superior or even common education, that, without it, mere intellectual improvement but furnishes the individual with the means and facilities not only of being more eminently wicked, but more extensively mischievous to society. This has been fully established, by actual examination, in France and other foreign countries, where the Bible and religion have been wholly excluded from schools and colleges. England never, since the era of the Reformation, gave up the Bible as a school-book; and, therefore, her moral and scientific eminence amongst all the nations of the world. Prussia has lately advanced ahead of England; and before a quarter of a century will, doubtless, have the best population on earth. Because she has decreed that all her children shall be educated, and that by well-qualified teachers, and that all shall read the Bible—Catholic and Protestant. They may have what version they please, but all must read the Bible—all must be morally as well as intellectually educated.

The objections to this course of education preferred by Deists, would have no weight, because they admit that the morality of Christianity is the best morality in the world; were it not that in a sectarian age, and in the hands of violent partizans, efforts at proselytism have sometimes been made, and, as they allege, may again be made. The remonstrances of a few Sceptics, backed by sectarian jealousy, could have no weight, if that system of education, which, so far as I can learn, from the developments of this day, is, on this subject, adopted here, were generally understood and duly appreciated. In this institution no party creed, or catechism, is taught. There is something which may be called a *common Christianity* amongst all Protestant parties, against which no intelligent Protestant could object—such as, the evidences of the Christian religion—the arguments that prove the divine person and mission of the common Saviour—the reasons why he is to be accredited and received as the only Saviour of the world—the necessity of faith in him—of repentance towards God—of a new heart and life—of supreme devotion to his will—the value of his death as a sin-offering—the necessity of his resurrection, and the certainty of his coming to judge and retribute the living and the dead according to their works. These great cardinal points, in which all Christians agree, I am bold to affirm ought to be taught in every Seminary in the length and breadth of the land. I, therefore, would fondly hope, that the example of this excellent institution may be followed still more generally by other schools, and that the whole community may be still more attentive to the moral culture of their offspring than heretofore.

Digitized by Google

From the questions which I had the honor to propound to the young ladies of the senior classes in the higher branches of their education, I ascertained that not the memory only, but the understanding also, of the pupils, had been specially cultivated and regarded by their preceptors. This I was anxious to ascertain, because I have found it a very common, and a very pernicious error, to store the warehouse of the memory, to the great neglect and detriment of the reflective and higher powers of the mind. We have had too much of this dictionary and index learning, without the proper discipline and invigoration of the reasoning powers. And hence we find persons of great knowledge and little wisdom, of strong memory and weak judgment, of many words and but few ideas. This, may I add, is generally more the fault of education than of nature—the error of the teacher rather than the defect of the pupil.

But, as was happily observed to the young ladies who have this day completed their academical course, no student, male or female, should imagine that his or her education is finished on their honorable discharge from the senior class of any institution, college, or university on earth. Man is never out of his pupilage. The best school does little more than present us with the necessary means of acquiring and communicating knowledge. They are always children, and not men, who regard a parchment in their pocket or in their desk, as a full proof of scholarship, and themselves as learned when they bid adieu to their *Alma Mater*. To be learned, and wise, and good, and useful members of society, we must be always learning; open to new light, inquisitive, and attentive to all that passes before us: for true it is, that observation, rather than imagination—attention, rather than genius, makes a great man or woman.

But while I cannot but congratulate the town of Steubenville, and all the surrounding country up and down the Ohio river, on the advantages of such an institution as this; and while I would congratulate the young ladies that are in attendance here, on the happy and propitious circumstances in which they are placed, might I, before I sit down, remind them that, as the body or animal frame exists for the intellectual, and the intellectual for the sake of our moral nature, (if it were possible to separate them,) so the end of all education is to fit us for the enjoyment of God, and the pure, and holy, and refined society of heaven.

Man is made for religion, and therefore it is, that without the knowledge and enjoyment of God, he never can be happy. Hence it is written, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," and "To depart from evil is understanding." And according to the same oracle of wisdom, the conclusion of the whole matter is, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole

Digitized by Google

happiness of man." There is but one book in the world that teaches us the will of God, and impossible is it for us to do the will of God if we do not know it; and impossible it is to know it, but by the study of the volume that contains it. How needful, then, that we give to the study of that book our best powers; that in youth we suffer its pure and heavenly principles to strike deep into our hearts—to diffuse its renovating and vivifying influence through our moral frame, and thus to plant in our bosoms the precious seeds of immortal bliss, which are to bud and blossom, and to bring forth fruit to eternity.

Some of the young ladies this evening described in very clear and glowing terms, the admirable contrivance of the human eye and of the human ear. If, then, I ask, God has bestowed so much wisdom, and power, and goodness in the formation of the eye and of the ear, if there are such traces of wonderful design in the exterior person, what must be the admirable frame and exquisite nature of that spiritual guest that inhabits this wonderful temple called the human body? And may I still more emphatically ask, What a wonderful and admirable Being, who himself is both the archetype and the architect of man; and who, by a simple enunciation of his will reared this glorious and stupendous frame of nature, thousands of whose mysteries are yet unexplored, and whose being and perfections are of course incomparably more recondite and unsearchable than this outward court which merely surrounds the palace of the universe? Well did the Great Teacher say, 'It is eternal life to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' "

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 157.]

THE DIALOGUE—(*continued.*)

Cleopas.—THE reason why our Lord walked upon the sea of Galilee, instead of going with the disciples in the bark,* will be understood by you when you are made acquainted with the circumstances by which he was at that time surrounded. Permit me to explain them.

It may be already known to you that our nation submitted at first with great unwillingness to the Roman yoke, and that their hatred of the Roman power has by no means diminished, but has

* Matth. xiv. John vi.

Digitized by Google

continued to exhibit itself in many conspiracies and rebellions. The spirit of sedition and revolt indeed has been so violent that the constant presence of the Roman cohorts which are quartered in various parts of Judea, and who occupy that strong fortress called Antonia which you perceive near the Temple, has not been sufficient to restrain it. This spirit has been encouraged by the remembrance of former splendor and power under the reigns of David and Solomon, and the great deliverances which the Lord vouchsafed to Israel in former days, and particularly by the long-cherished expectation of a Messiah who should restore to us prosperity and dominion. Hence nothing has been at any time necessary to a rebellion but that the people should find a leader, and deceivers have often taken advantage of this to cause insurrections, in which many have been destroyed.* You may judge, then, how difficult it was for our Lord, *in such a state of public feeling*, to announce himself as the promised Messiah; and how great the wisdom and prudence required to present the proofs of his Divine mission without at the same time furnishing occasion for a revolt against the Roman power!

Agenor.—In Cyprus I have often heard strangers speak of the obstinate resistance of the Jewish nation to the Romans, and I am curious to learn how it was possible for Jesus to perform such miracles before the people without being acknowledged by them as the Messiah, and without being made the head of a political faction.

Cleopas.—His meekness, and utter disregard of earthly grandeur; his poverty, and his humility surprised and confounded the more influential and aspiring among the people. Being possessed of a turbulent and selfish spirit, they were unable to comprehend the gentleness and self-abandonment of a character so different from their own; and were irritated by disappointment when one bearing such high credentials seemed not only unfitted for the accomplishment of their ambitious designs, but directly opposed to their principles and practices. Hence while his spiritual-mindedness and heavenly conversation dazzled and blinded their understandings, his just reproofs excited their animosity.† But the multitude could not be thus restrained. They loved to hear

* Josephus' Jewish Wars *passim*; Acts v. 36, 37. † Matth. xii. 14, 39; xv. 1—20.

Digitized by Google

his instructions; they brought to him the lame, the sick, the blind; they saw his mighty power, and, filled with wonder and admiration, followed him from city to city; and increasing often to the number of several thousand, began to form plans of sedition, and to say to those who doubted, "When Messiah comes will he do more miracles than this man?" Upon these occasions, and indeed whenever great multitudes were collected, it was the custom of our Lord to retire immediately to some secret or distant place until the popular fervor had abated and the people were dispersed.*

It was upon one of these occasions, when thronged by an immense concourse, that Jesus in order to be alone with his disciples, took shipping with them and sailed across the sea of Galilee to a desert and mountainous region.† Such, however, was the enthusiasm of the people, that, discovering by some means his destination, an immense multitude hastened thither on foot, and were ready to receive him at his landing.‡ Pitying their condition he resumed his teachings, and, finally, after having healed many sick which they had brought to him, as evening approached, he was led from motives of compassion to perform the remarkable miracle of feeding this vast multitude, now increased to more than five thousand, with five loaves and two small fishes!§ Ah, you may well conceive their astonishment when the very fragments of the repast filled twelve baskets! And you may conjecture the tendency of those feelings and convictions by which they were inspired when they exclaimed upon seeing this miracle, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world!"‖

Now Jesus knew what was in their hearts, and was perfectly acquainted with their motives, wishes, and designs. He knew that a conspiracy existed, the object of which was to take him by force and proclaim him king in opposition to Cesar, and he perceived that the multitude were now fully bent on carrying their designs into execution.¶ Under these circumstances, he might have defeated their purpose by the exertion of the same Divine energy by which he delivered himself from the hands of the

* Matth. v. 1: viii. 18: Luke v. 16; ix. x. † Matth. xiv. 13: Mark vi. 31, 32: John vi. 1, 3. ‡ Mark vi. 33, 34. § John vi. 9. ‖ John vi. 14. ¶ John vi. 14, 15.

Digitized by Google

Nazarenes;* but the mode he adopted was the following:—When evening approached, he constrained the disciples to enter their bark, and cross the lake, leaving him alone with the people.† The latter, supposing him now completely in their power, permitted him to dismiss them and even to retire to another part of the mountain, where he watched and prayed, while they were perfecting their seditious schemes.‡ About the fourth watch of the night, however, he descended to the shore and walked upon the lake towards the bark which was about 30 furlongs distant, retarded by a tempestuous sea and a contrary wind; not indeed for his convenience, for, as at Emmaus, he seemed as though he would have passed on,§ but that the disciples might be witnesses of his power. When they saw him, they were terrified, supposing it to be a spirit; but being re-assured by his voice, fear gave place to astonishment, and Peter with that ready confidence for which he is so remarkable, dared even to step out of the bark to meet his Master. But when he saw the raging waves which seemed ready to engulph him, his faith as suddenly failed, and beginning to sink he cried for aid to Jesus, who took him by the hand, saying, "O! thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"‖ When they had entered the bark, the storm, for which there was no further occasion, ceased, and they were immediately landed upon the territory of Gennesaret.¶ Such were the circumstances which occasioned the miracle of walking upon the water.

Agenor.—It was, then, to frustrate the plans of these conspirators! Truly, it was an astonishing miracle, and for an important purpose. But what did the people?

Cleopas.—They sought Jesus diligently as soon as morning appeared, and were surprised and disappointed when they were unable to find him. Nor could they imagine that he had crossed the lake, for they knew that his disciples had gone away alone, and in the only boat** which was there, although some boats from Tiberias passed along at no great distance after Jesus had fed the multitude. Some, however, were so persevering, that, after they had ascertained certainly that he was not upon that

* Luke iv. 16—30. † John vi. 15, 16: Mark vi. 45. ‡ John vi. 15. § Ib. 19—21: Mark vi. 48. ‖ Matth. xiv. 22—31. ¶ Id. xiv. 34. ** John vi. 22.

Digitized by Google

side of the lake, they took shipping and crossed over to seek him in the land of Gennesaret. When they found him in the synagogue of Capernaum, their first question was, Rabbi, when did you come hither? But he, appreciating their motives, rebuked their selfish purposes and their unbelief, while he presented to them the spiritual character and object of his mission in the most striking similitudes. They were now offended, being unable to comprehend his meaning, and for the time abandoned their design.*

Agenor.—I clearly perceive the critical situation in which Jesus was placed by the circumstances of the times—the popular discontent—the hatred of the rulers towards him on one hand; and, on the other, the turbulent and seditious disposition of the people. And I can see how skillfully he prevented a rebellion, and avoided being entangled in a political broil in the case which you have related. But pray tell me how such consequences were avoided when he announced himself as the Messiah, and when the people had his own declaration to rely upon, instead of their own uncertain and doubtful conclusions from the miracles which they witnessed.

Cleopas.—The miracles proved that God was with him—that he was sent of God.† They did not of themselves prove him to be the Messiah, for miraculous power was exercised by the Prophets of old, by the Apostles during our Lord's ministry, and is now bestowed also upon the church. In the absence, therefore, of any declaration on the part of Jesus that he was the promised Messiah, the conclusions of the people, with regard to him, derived from the miracles alone, were, as you observe, necessarily vague and uncertain. And he left them in this uncertainty, for he did not at this time publicly announce himself.

Agenor.—You tell me a strange thing. Did he not publicly acknowledge himself to be the Messiah?

Cleopas.—By no means. On the contrary, he carefully concealed it. It was his invariable custom to enjoin secresy even upon those upon whom he wrought miracles, in order to prevent public excitement.‡ And when the demons who knew that he was the Son of God would fain have announced him as such, with the malicious purpose of creating an insurrection of the people, he

* John vi. 25—66. † Id. v. 36. ‡ Matth. viii. 4; xii. 16: Mark v. 43.

Digitized by Google

silenced them and cast them out.* It was his wish to keep the Jews in doubt concerning this matter, as the only means of preventing tumult, and until the purposes of his mission were accomplished. The rulers earnestly desired such an acknowledgment upon his part that they might accuse him to the Roman government, and they sought to obtain it by various methods. Sometimes they affected to complain of his reserve, saying, "How long do you make us to doubt? If you be the Christ, tell us plainly." And when he appealed to the works which he performed as evidence of his Divine mission, and declared that he and the Father were one, they, construing his words to imply that he was God, endeavored by threats of stoning to compel him to admit or deny this construction. But he disappointed their wishes and escaped the snare by an appeal to a figurative use of the term "gods" in their law as applied to those to whom the word of God came: thus confounding them by an authority which they were compelled to admit, and evading that absolute construction which they would have forced upon him, while at the same time he took occasion to assert a superior claim to the title, 'The Son of God,' and again adduced his miracles as evidence that he was sent of God, 'that he was in the Father and the Father in him.'† At other times they employed spies to feign themselves just men, and watch him that they might take hold of his words, so as to deliver him into the power and authority of the Roman governor.‡ But by the most consummate wisdom he defeated all their machinations, and confounded them by the justness of his replies.

The common people were left in the same uncertainty.—"Whom say the people that I am?" inquired he upon one occasion of the disciples. They replied, "John the Baptist; but some say, Elias; and others say, that one of the old Prophets is risen again." "But whom," inquired he again, "say ye that I am?" Our beloved Peter was the first to answer, "The Messiah of God." He had heard at our Lord's baptism that voice from heaven which announced him as the Son of God—a declaration which the multitude seemed not to have heard or appreciated,§ but the truth and import of which Peter now openly confessed. Our Lord re-

* Matth. iii. 29; see also Mark iii 11, 12: Luke iv. 41. † John x. 30—39. ‡ Luke xx. 20—26. § Matth iii. 17: John v. 37; Id. xii. 29.

Digitized by Google

warded the confidence, candor, and readiness of Peter in making this acknowledgment by bestowing upon him the privilege of opening the kingdom of heaven to men, declaring that upon this truth his church should be built and that the gates of Hades should not prevail against it.* But, at the same time, to prevent the improper use which the people would have made of such a confession, *he strictly prohibited all his disciples from telling any one that he was the Messiah.*†

Agenor.—And was this truth concealed merely to avoid political disturbance? If so, how was it made public?

Cleopas.—This was but one reason of its concealment. It truly was not the design of our Lord to appear as a political agitator. It would (to speak after the manner of men) have frustrated the object of his mission had he been placed at the head of a faction, and taken and put to death *as a rebel against the Roman power,* which a premature declaration of this truth might have effected. Its concealment was therefore also necessary that he might have time to finish the work which the Father gave him to do—sufficient space and opportunity to display the glory of the Divine character and present the evidences of his Divine mission. It was finally announced by our Lord himself in the most public manner before the Jewish Sanhedrim. His hour having come, and having been betrayed by a professed disciple, he was seized by night in the garden of Gethsemane, and hurried before the Sanhedrim assembled for the purpose in the Temple. He fearlessly appealed to those who had heard his sayings,‡ and his enemies were unable to bring any testimony to condemn him or to prove that he had ever committed himself in any way with regard to the existing government.§ It was at this moment, when the evidence of their witnesses failed, and the High Priest in virtue of his office abjured him by the living God to declare if he were the Christ the Son of God—it was at this moment that he answered before the representatives of the whole nation, "I am, and I say unto you, hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting

---

* Matth. xvi. 13—21: Acts ii. 14; Id. x. 5, 32. † Matth. viii. 29, 30: Luke ix. 20, 21, 36. The revelation of this truth by our Lord to Nathaniel and to the man cured of blindness (John ix. 35, 38.) were private, and to disciples. Its declaration to the woman of Samaria does not affect the question, inasmuch as the Jews and Samaritans were at enmity and had nothing in common. ‡ John xviii. 20, 21. § Mark xiv. 55—59: Luke xxiii. 14.

Digitized by Google

on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the High Priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what farther need have we of witnesses?" The council answered, "He is worthy of death."*

Agenor.—Why was this confession reserved for this precise moment?

Cleopas.—*That he might not be condemned for any inferior reason,* BUT MIGHT HONOR THIS CONFESSION BY DYING FOR IT.

He knew that by reserving the public declaration of this truth to this moment, he would die for it alone. And this truly happened; for though the Jews tried to prejudice Pilate against him, and excite his fears by falsely representing Jesus as forbidding to give tribute to Cesar,† (which he was so far from doing, that he even paid tribute himself lest they should have any ground of accusation or offence,‡) and as calling himself King;§ yet Pilate knew that they had delivered him from envy, and found upon examination no proof of these charges.‖ "Are you the King of the Jews?" said Pilate. Jesus replied, "Do you say this of yourself, or did others tell you concerning me?" This elicited from Pilate the acknowledgment that he, the representative of the Roman government, had not preferred the charge. "Am I a Jew?" said he; "your own nation, yes, the chief priests have delivered you to me. What have you done?" "My kingdom," answered Jesus, "is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my adherents would have fought to prevent my falling into the hands of the Jews; but my kingdom is not hence."¶ Now our Lord could well speak thus. For you must know that on the night when he was betrayed, he intimated to us, that he who had no sword, should now sell his mantle and buy one; for that the scripture which says, "He was ranked among malefactors," was about to be fulfilled in him. Two swords being produced, he said, "It is enough." He went immediately to the garden of Gethsemane, whither we accompanied him, and when the armed multitude came to take him at a time and in a manner caculated to provoke a resistance of which they might accuse him, Peter, not knowing but that it was our Master's pleasure, drew his sword and struck one of the High Priest's

* Matth. xxvii. 63—66. † Luke xxiii. 2. ‡ Matth. xvii. 27. § Luke xxiii. 2.
‖ Luke xxiii. 14. ¶ John xviii. 33—37.

Digitized by Google

servants. This gave our Lord the desired opportunity to obviate all suspicion as to any design to promote rebellion, or seek an earthly crown. He immediately ordered Peter to put up his sword, and healed by a miracle the wound which had been inflicted.* So far, therefore, from commanding his adherents to fight, he had not only forbidden them, but remedied by Divine power the effect of Peter's mistaken zeal. He could then well appeal to this fact to prove to Pilate that he sought not an earthly kingdom. When he spoke of a kingdom, Pilate said, "You are a King, then?" Jesus answered, "*You* say that I am a King. For this I was born; and for this I came into the world, to give testimony to THE TRUTH." Pilate, perceiving his innocence, would have released him, declaring to the Jews that he found nothing culpable in him.† But, upon inquiring "What shall I do with Jesus whom they call Messiah?" they cried out, "Crucify him! Crucify him!"‡

It was, then, for this confession that he was baptized in sufferings,§ as he had himself foretold—he was crucified, and buried—but God hath raised him from the dead and given him glory. He hath ascended into heaven, forever set down at the right hand of power, to bestow repentance and remission of sins; and it is upon a confession of this same truth that men are now baptized in water—buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also they are raised again to walk in newness of life.‖ L.

LETTERS TO ENGLAND—*No. I.*

PITTSBURG, *Pa.* May 15th, 1837.

MR. J. WALLIS:

Dear Brother—YOUR favor of February 21st, 1837, was received here last month; and had it not been for circumstances too varied to be related, and too imperious to be neglected or controlled, should have been acknowledged at an earlier date. And now that I have, during my visit to this city, appropriated a few minutes to converse with you, and through you to address my brethren in England, permit me with all despatch to proceed to

* John xviii. 3—11. † Id. xviii. 37, 38. ‡ Matth. xxvii. 22.
§ Matth. xx. 22. ‖ Romans vi. 3—5: Coloss. ii. 12, 13.

Digitized by Google

the items on which you claim information, or to which you invite my attention.

The cause of reformation continues to be successfully plead in this New World. Still, however, it has to contend with its old enemies—"the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life." "The friendship of the world," in this nineteenth century and in these United States, is yet "enmity against God." Satan is not more propitious to the cause of Messiah, than when he offered him "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" for a single act of homage at the shrine of his ambition. Hence reformation, evangelical reformation, has both the wind and the tide of popular applause in its face; and has, through much powerful opposition, to advance on the entrenchments of error and immorality, sacred as popish relics, through the conceit of a venerable antiquity. The continued action of the artillery of eternal truth on the ramparts and outworks of error, has indeed made deep and numerous breaches in the walls, and promises the final demolition of those strong holds of human corruption at no very distant and future day. True, however, that were we to compute how long ere the Man of Sin shall be destroyed, in the ratio of what has been done within the last quarter of a century, as respects the numbers reclaimed from his dominion, we might yet regard that event as at a great distance. But when we survey the whole premises—when we compute the onward march of the spirit of free discussion and earnest inquiry —when we contemplate the shattered and tottering foundations of many human establishments, as now made bare to the optics of large portions of the Christian community—when we see the spirit of the age possessing all the detachments of the Protestant armies, and breaking over the artificial walls of their respective encampments, and the principles of the inductive philosophy applied to the traditions of the Apostles—when we take into the account all that is doing and done in this way, we seem to live ten years in one; and thus find as many centuries of progress as there are tens in the space of our existence. We are, in this sense, living the age of the antediluvians in three-score or four-score years; and if superadded to all this, we regard the plagues that are visiting, and about to visit the haunts of iniquity and the

Digitized by Google

citadels of error and corruption, we have much reason to anticipate the continued advancement of the cause of reformation, till, like a millstone, Babylon the Great shall be hurled into the sea, to rise no more forever.

The last year has been signalized by various trials and difficulties which have in some places occurred, and by a peculiar secular spirit which has been most signally displayed in the commercial world, by a *mock prosperity* which has inveigled all classes, and by the consequent struggle to amass worldly distinctions by means of the new and various channels opened to avarice and ambition. All Protestant communities seem to have felt the paralyzing influence of the fortune-hunting schemes, which, like Jonah's gourd, seem to have grown up in a night, and to have multiplied upon us in the direct ratio of all the facilities which a country so large, so varied, and so rich in Nature's bounties, presents to the sincere and devout aspirants after earthly good. The baits and fascinations of time and sense, so admirably suited to the passions of men in the flesh, and so propitiously presented, as in the present highly artificial state of social prosperity, have so engrossed the thoughtless multitude as to have called forth a universal complaint of all the sects on the deficits of the harvest of the last season. America has been too prosperous to be grateful or pious; and as it is impossible to serve God and Mammon, a great proportion of her citizens have thought it wisdom to devote themselves to the latter rather than to the former, especially as they prefer the present momentary fruition of sin to all the future and eternal joys of the Christian's heaven.

I could wish that I had authority to say that all our churches had escaped the contagion, and that they had continued to display that unwearied diligence and intense feeling in the cause of conversion so essential to the rapid progress and extensive conquests of the gospel. Still, however, in various quarters of the land the cause advances with a steadfast pace; and the seasonings and trials to which in some places it has been subjected, will, from various hopeful indications, it is presumed, cause it to strike root downward and bear more fruit upward than before. Christians are slow to learn that when they give themselves to the Lord they are expected to give themselves to one another, and to con-

Digitized by Google

secrate all their means of doing good to building up the Lord's temple, and to doing the Lord's business in this world.

We have no regular statistics—no annual reports, that, with numerical accuracy, enable us to state the increase during the last year throughout the whole United States. So far, however, as we have documents, or have heard from the churches, we are warranted in stating the increase to be considerable. But we have no idea of flattering our brethren that it is what it ought to be, or what their means warrant us to expect it to be. Did they faithfully carry out their own principles and use all the means which the Lord has given them, much, very much more would be done in one year than could formerly have been done in many years. When the Messiah taught his disciples to pray to the Lord of the harvest for more laborers, those addressed had no other means of obtaining laborers but by their prayers. We do not believe in praying for laborers, unless every thing else is done which the precepts of the Apostles enjoin upon the churches in regard to the conversion of the world. Then, but not till then, can we conscientiously and consistently ask for help. Christians must learn that the conversion of the world is the honorable employment to which the Lord has called them. And that they may have the whole honor of this great work, he has sent neither Apostles, Prophets, nor Angels to assist them, since he established the church in the world.

Touching your inquiries on some matters, I hasten to observe, —that our brethren generally regard the church as the only moral or religious association which they can lawfully patronize. Hence they form not Missionary, Education, Tract, Bible, Temperance, Anti-Masonic, or Anti-Slavery confederations. If these are good works, they belong to the church in her own proper character; and every member of the church is, as a *Christian*, obliged to promote these objects as far as he has the means and the opportunity. The Christian institution, in our judgment, demands of all its subjects their best efforts to put down all profanity, unrighteousness, injustice, oppression, and cruelty in the world; and to promote every benevolent, humane, and charitable object which can ameliorate the conditions of human existence. That the gospel ought to be preached; that evange-

Digitized by Google

lists or missionaries ought to be sent out and sustained by the church; that the whole community should be intellectually and morally educated—every child born upon our soil so trained as to be a useful, safe, and honorable member of society; that the Bible always, and sometimes religious tracts, newspapers, magazines and pamphlets should be widely circulated in the world; that Christians should be temperate in all things, and especially so in the use of all intoxicating liquors, and perhaps sometimes wholly abstinent; that they should not, after communing at the Lord's table, unite in any secret, political, or moral combination with the Lord's enemies, Turks, Jews, or Atheists; that they should oppose all schemes of robbery and oppression, whether the victims be white, black, or yellow—bond servant or hired servant; that Christians should render to their servants every thing that is just and equal; that they should not, even when the laws permit them, violate or cause others to violate God's most ancient, venerable, and holy institution of marriage, by selling a wife from her husband, or infants from the embraces of maternal and paternal affection; that they should treat every human being, without regard to political or other factitious and circumstantial distinctions and differences, as their fellow-creatures, as subjects of the same Divine moral government, objects of God's philanthropy, to be taught his religion, and trained for immortality, are propositions or tenets held by us sacred as the precepts of Christ.

We would, indeed, have no objections to co-operate in these matters with *all Christians*, and raise contributions for all such purposes as, in our judgment, are promotive of the Divine glory or of human happiness, *whether or not they belong to our churches:* for we find in all Protestant parties Christians as exemplary as ourselves according to their and our relative knowledge and opportunities; but we cannot form a confederacy with the troops of Satan, or tax his subjects to sustain the Christian cause; and, therefore, so long as all these associations openly and avowedly form a community on any one of these bonds of union, irrespective of citizenship in the kingdom of heaven; I say, so long as they hold communion with profane and ungodly persons, or with Gentiles of no creed and every creed, because of a single point of coincidence, whatever that point may be, we cannot unite

Digitized by Google

with them, or sail under such a flag. Besides, if such schemes are really necessary, then has the church failed—then the Divine institution must yield the palm to institutions merely human.

We sincerely regret that the church, owing to Protestant partyism, has been so crippled as to have lost much of her converting, salutary, and redeeming power in the world; but we prefer to restore the church to her ancient dignity, rather than to attempt to reform the world without her. Could Christians feel their responsibilities, and understand what the Lord expects from his people, they would be ashamed to see themselves outdone and eclipsed by natural benevolence or common humanity, dissociated from faith in Christ and the hope of heaven. They would be provoked not merely to emulate, but to transcend deistical liberality and benevolence. Rising in the majesty of holy truth and heavenly love, and with the magnanimity and sympathies of the Holy Spirit, they would be first in every good work, and, like their Master, be constant and indefatigable in doing good.

Touching the republication of my writings, or of any essays or communications in the periodicals which I have conducted, you must judge of what is most suitable to your countrymen and the peculiar crisis. We have had much more controversy thrown upon our hands than we either expected or desired. We did anticipate much more intelligence and liberality in our Christian associations than we found. And I need not tell you that there is a peculiar rancor or inveteracy in all domestic quarrels, especially among brothers and cousins, which exaggerates every thing and exquisitely embitters the feelings, so that often pure hatred for love's sake is the only offering acceptable to the genius of these family misunderstandings, which are always violent in the inverse ratio of the value of the points at issue. Hence we often witness a more respectful and obliging intercourse between a Papist and a Protestant, than between two Protestant brothers that only differ about a single shade of opinion not more important than the difference between a pea-green and a sea-green leaf.

I am pleased to observe that a better spirit is at work amongst the most evangelical Protestants in this country, and that many of the Baptists in America are in some very important points

Digitized by Google

advancing towards the very ground which in our case a few years since was judged unauthorized and unsafe. Of course such communications and controversial disquisitions as grew out of this state of affairs, may not be applicable or suitable to the present condition of religious society in England. You may, however, assure your Protestant brethren in Britain, in contradiction of idle rumors, that I still worship the same God and Father through the same Lord and Saviour, and by the teachings of the same Holy Spirit whom I acknowledged in North Britain in the days of my youth; and that although I have often canvassed, and, as I think, impartially reconsidered the great Protestant doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ as the only true and proper sin-offering, and Christ himself as the only true and proper Mediator—equally Divine and human—Emanuel, whose blood alone cleanses us from all sin, I have never yet found one good reason to dissent from it. On the contrary, though I may sometimes dissent from criticisms, speculations, and untaught questions of many distinguished Protestants on this most sublime and supernatural of all Christian tenets, still I could with as good conscience and as perfect freedom, as I once did, bow my knees with Greville Ewing, Ralph Wardlaw, Alexander Carson, or any of the most distinguished of your Protestant theologians, so far as their or my views on these grand points are concerned.

But while I coincide with them in these most vital principles of our religion, and could, as far as possible, in all matters of opinion, or of speculation, bear with every discrepancy of a purely intellectual kind; and, indeed, approach to their views as nearly as I could to lesson the breaches now existing; still there are some very important truths and facts in Christianity which I think they do not clearly perceive, and duties which are neither understood nor practised in the communities over which they preside. The fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ is not, in my judgment, attainable in the societies which have grown up under their administration. But of all this you can judge from the documents in your possession as well as I.

Meanwhile, I must close; but, at your request, I intend to address our Protestant brethren in England once every month during the current year. "Now may the God of peace, who

Digitized by Google

brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus, the Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you fit for every good work, to do his will, producing in you what is acceptable in his sight, through Jesus Christ—to whom be glory forever and ever." Amen!

In the hope of immortality, ever yours,

A. CAMPBELL.

Discussion of Universalism.

No. II.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

Dear Sir—AFTER so long a silence, which has been imposed on me from the impossibility of my obtaining sight of your April letter till after my return from the South, I resume my pen. I sincerely regret that you did not forward me a copy of your letter to *Virginia*, agreeable to my request sent you from Richmond, or that if you did so, it never reached me.*

I also regret as sincerely, to find, on the perusal of your April letter, that it is no reply, nor even an attempt to reply to my last. I did hope, my dear sir, when I engaged in a discussion of the all-important subject of controversy between us, that I had found an honorable and high-minded opponent, who would stand forth with Christian candor and manly boldness in defence of what he considers the truth and holy sanctions of the gospel of Christ—one who felt himself above those little quibbles, and stratagems, those bandyings of words about *challenges*, and the substitution of new and multiform questions for debate, unnecessary laws of evidence, rules of discussion, etc. etc., to the neglect of the main points at issue. And I will still cherish the fond hope that what to me appears, in your letter now before me, to be a departure from the course of the honorable and high-minded Christian controversialist, is only an exception to your general character—that you will shortly return from this strange digression, resume the discussion of the points on which we are already at issue, and fairly, candidly, and fully investigate them *pro bono publico*. For I am fully confident that all of our readers, and I believe most of yours, are much more desirous of, and would be more essentially benefitted by seeing a thorough and candid discussion of the points of difference between us, than by seeing an *everlasting controversy* ABOUT *a discussion*.

* On arriving at New York, I found a copy of Mr. C's letter which had been mailed to *Baltimore* (date not in the post mark) to the care of Rev. L. S. Everett, for me, and remailed to New York between the 20th and 30th of April. But as I had made no request to have any letter addressed for me *later than March*, and Mr. E. did not know whither to forward it at so late a season, I did not get it while in Virginia.

Digitized by Google

I have too often been disgusted with long controversies about a *challenge*, as to which party had given it, when perhaps both parties had virtually, but neither verbally, given it.

You make a labored effort to prove that you have been *challenged* by the Universalists; but I think you do not succeed in the effort. For certainly *I* have not challenged you—Spencer did not challenge you—and though you say Mr. Montgomery did, the proof you give of it only shows that he modestly inquired of you, "*Will you continue to publish letters from me, if I continue to write on the subject of my letter to you?*" Suppose A. B. C. and D. to meet in social mood at the house of C.—A. converses with C. awhile on the subject of religion. He then retires, and B. resumes the conversation where A. left it. They are soon interrupted, and B. says to C., I should be glad to converse longer on this subject for mutual edification, if convenient, for I deem it of vast importance; but as it is inconvenient for me, I would like to hear you and D. converse further on the points whereon you differ. C. and D. both assent to the proposal. Now, in all this there would be no challenge given or received, or requisite. It is a mutual agreement for a conversation on a particular subject. Precisely so stands the case with us in my view.

I must however confess that, taking every thing into consideration, pertaining to this matter, you occupy a somewhat singular position. You first appear very anxious the subject should be discussed—say to Mr. Montgomery, you have fully made up your mind to canvass it—think justice was not done to it by Messrs. Ely and Thomas, and resolve if a fair opportunity presents of getting glory in the controversy, to engage at once. But as Haman of old scorned to lay hands upon Mordecai alone, lest he should not by his death exterminate the whole race, so the celebrated Mr. Campbell scorns to re-engage in the controversy with an amiable young man "in the bloom of 25, or thereabout," though he acknowledges him to be "a promising Goliah." He resolves on "encountering some of the older giants, the Anakims, or Zamzummins of Universalism," and to let "these sons of Hercules" know that he could kill something more than a "stripling." Well, he reaches the land of the giants, the far-famed city of Boston, and there is introduced to one of these mighty men of Universalism, preaches in the presence of most of them (*perhaps* they hear him allude to their dogmas,) and is very anxious to start a controversy with the mightiest of them all; *but*——

* * * as he never challenges others for controversy, only accepts challenges when others give them, he could only say to them, or hint by his actions, "Come, gentlemen giants, you Anakins and Zamzummins, just give me a challenge for a discussion—I'll meet the stoutest of you if you'll only *challenge* me to fight." But, alas! no man challenges him—he was either not large enough to attract their notice, or else they were afraid of him and did not dare to encounter so mighty a champion, or else they had not the bump of combativeness very strongly developed! And Mr. C. returns to the shades of Bethany, without having won a single laurel in battle with any Universalist, save the little one he picked up at Lockport, N. Y.!

Having returned from the East without starting there any controversy with what he is pleased to style the "sons of Hercules," it was expected that my friend Campbell would have so good an appetite for the

Digitized by Google

prosecution of the controversy already begun, as to need no other stimulus to engage right heartily in it, but to be reminded of the engagement already entered into with Mr. Montgomery.*

Accordingly, without allowing myself to doubt your intention to fulfil the agreement on your part, I wrote you November 14, merely to remind you how I understood that agreement, and to consult you about the *time* of re-publishing in our paper what was already before your readers, and then continuing the discussion of the subject already under consideration. You replied November 29, tacitly admitted the correctness of my understanding of said agreement, but offered another alternative, viz. an *oral debate*, (which some of my friends, though I doubted it myself, supposed to be a stratagem to get rid of the discussion already commenced,) leaving the acceptance of the alternative optional with me; and saying in regard to the *time* of resuming the discussion, that your attention would most likely be wholly engrossed with the Catholic discussion till the first of February, and hence it would be injudicious to divert your attention from it till after that period. I answered this, December 23, informing you that I chose to adhere to the engagement already entered into, rather than accept of your proposed alternative, and should accordingly re-publish the articles from the Harbinger, in season to follow them with "*my reply to your last article between the first and middle of February.* To this you made no objection, no reply. Accordingly on the 10th of February, 1837, the 5th number of the Discussion, viz. my Reply to yours in the Harbinger of February, 1836, was duly published. It was re-published in the Harbinger in March last: and now, after waiting about *three months* from the date of that letter, I am permitted to see your April No. of the Harbinger containing your last letter to me! And what do I see? Why, my opponent horror-smitten at my eagerness for the debate, and at my entire want of method; nay, even more, I have no proposition to discuss, and am "without law, or rule, or stipulation in the case." You would fain persuade our readers that I have "been too eager for the combat," have "gone a-head as though I were hasting out of cannon shot of the enemy," and although I have "spread the controversy over the whole face of the Atlantic," and have "got a little of every thing" in my letter, yet I have only been beating the air, not knowing what I was about, and in all that I have said, you cannot find a single proposition to controvert, not one on which you are at issue with me. Hence you very quaintly ask, "What are the propositions which we have agreed to discuss? What are the rules of this discussion? How long is it to continue? Who is to open and close it? What are the rules of evidence to be relied on? What the authorities to be admitted? &c. &c." But, my dear sir, permit me to query in my turn. Why are these questions *now* propounded in the 6th letter of the discussion? Why not proposed to Mr. Montgomery when you agreed to continue the discussion, only accepting of me instead of him, as the defender of Universalism? If you forgot to put them then, why not put them to me in your letter of November 29th? Or if you forgot it then, why not propose them after you received mine of December 23d? in which I informed you I should *reply to your last, early in Feb-*

* See "Remarks on the state of the Controversy," and two short letters of Mr. M relative to it, published in this paper of February 3, 1837, which Mr. C. has not seen fit to publish in the Harbinger.

Digitized by Google

ruary. But no, you never thought of these questions then, nor till after my reply had been published, nor am I permitted to see them till near *three months* from *that* time! Is it not fair, then, to infer, and will not your readers naturally infer, that not until you read my letter of February 10th, did you *think* of proposing any such questions?—that you then found, that in order to reply to the arguments therein contained, *hic labor est, hoc opus est—?* And hence that you had recourse to the *ruse de guerre* which your Aprill letter exhibits, in order to divert the attention of your readers from the real points at issue between us? But, sir, "they are silly birds that are caught in such a snare." And after the perusal of this specimen of your controversial talents, and the first question which you gravely propose for opening the discussion, viz. "Is there any *punishment* for sin," I should expect you to be the last man in Christendom to accuse your opponent of having recourse to the "*ad captandum* style of controversy."

What, sir, no question at issue between us for discussion! And yet you say you are now "before the public in defence of *the sanctions* of the gospel, of the basis of God's moral government, and of all political government, against a system of religious and moral belief which makes *satan* a metaphor, *hell* a fable, and *punishment after death* a mere bugbear!" And pray, sir, what are those *sanctions* in defence of which you stand before the public? (and, by the way, who is the advocate of the "system of religious and moral belief" of which you speak? for surely I know of no such system, and have seen nothing in this discussion thus far, that savors of it in the least.) Do you suppose our readers are all perfectly purblind, when you say, "neither of these gentlemen" (Spencer, Montgomery or myself) "were ever parties to a discussion with" yourself?—that "there was no controversy begun?" and that you "had no controversy with" Mr. M. "about terms or inferences?" Why, really, sir, did not Spencer lay down certain premises and introduce certain terms, and hence draw conclusions in favor of Universalism, and did you not *controvert* at least his conclusions? Did not Mr. M. *controvert* your arguments, and you his again in turn? And did I not formally reply again to yours? and *and yet there was no controversy begun!!!* Why, really, sir, are we to infer from hence, that notwithstanding your pretended arguments against these Universalists, you in fact and mentally acceded to all they have said, and are yourself a true Universalist? Very well, then, come out honestly and own it, and let your readers "have no more of this lure" to lead them back into a system which you do not believe yourself.

As to your question, "What are the propositions which we have agreed to discuss?" I will shortly point out what propositions *are already under discussion*, my arguments on which remain unanswered. "Who is to open and close it?" *It is already opened*—how, when, and by whom, you, and I, and our readers all know: and it will be closed by whom and at such time as we shall hereafter agree. These are not necessary questions at this stage of the controversy, though I have no objections to having them settled fairly at any time. As to the rules of the discussion, the evidence and authorities to be admitted, etc., I consider that honorable controversialists need never be concerned about these, when they engage with honorable opponents. If either party should at any time depart from the common rules of courtesy and pro-

Digitized by Google

priety, or attempt to bolster up his cause by inadmissible or disreputable authority, the other party would not fail to take advantage of it and turn it against the aggressor. The self-respect of each party ought to be a sufficient guarantee on these points.

But to show you that I am disposed to accommodate you in any thing and every thing reasonable—to have distinct and well defined questions and propositions to discuss, and all reasonable rules, regulations and limits fixed, I will proceed,

First, to the questions and propositions for discussion:—

1. Are *sheol*, *hades*, and *gehenna*, (separately or together) ever used in the Scriptures to express a place or state of endless misery?

Although I had honestly supposed you had relinquished the affirmative of this question, from the fact that you said, "To save time and labor, *I will concede the whole*," (which Spencer advanced concerning these words,) and though Mr. Montgomery appears to have understood you in the same way when he declares, "It gave me much satisfaction to perceive that you also was much pleased with it," (Spencer's letter,) "because you admit the truth of his quotation, *simply excepting his inferences;*" yet, as you have now taken back that concession, which I am perfectly willing you should do, as you appear to have more time and labor to spare at present, you have now the affirmative of this question to sustain. I take the negative of course.

2. Do the words *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, etc., when applied to the punishment of the wicked, mean duration without end? You have already taken the affirmative and I the negative in this question.

3. Is there "any word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked," or which can "certify us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end?" I have already taken the affirmative and you the negative of this question.

4. "Shall eternal life (meaning thereby endless holiness and happiness,) be, according to the Scriptures, the ultimate destiny of all mankind? Here I have the affirmative and you the negative. This question is already in discussion before our readers substantially, in your statement that this doctrine is "out of the Record and to you a new revelation," and my proof by a multitude of witnesses adduced in my letter of February 10th, that is *in the Record.*

Thus we have each of us, two affirmatives and two negatives to sustain, and the laboring oars are equally divided between us, as they should be. It is but fair and equal that each should have an *affirmative* as well as a *negative* to defend. And this you will not object to, unless your system is a system of *negation* and your *faith* consists in *unbelief*, especially after declaring that you are "before the public *in defence of the sanctions of the gospel*," etc. This would be but fair and equal, even if a challenge had been given, though I have shown that none has been given on our side.

Secondly. As to the evidences admissible, I have no objections to the rules you mentioned, except that I would prefer that neither of us should be denied the advantages derivable from the *subordinate* lights of nature and reason, and the translations and comments of men of acknowledged eminence and standing in the republic of letters.

Thirdly and finally, for the rules of discussion. I will not object to

Digitized by Google

any of the seven rules you propose except the first, which as you see above, is by the state of the controversy somewhat modified, and the second and fifth, of which I will offer modifications or substitutes, which I think all impartial judges will acknowledge to be fair and honorable. I object to the rule that "the respondent, (meaning yourself,) shall close the discussion," that is unqualifiedly, by occupying six pages of the Harbinger after seeing my last letter, to which I shall be absolutely inhibited from replying. For it would not only be contrary to all rules of forensic debate, but would give you great advantage, by affording you an opportunity of introducing new and labored arguments in a new field, to which you knew no reply could be made, and thus afford a plausible pretext for claiming the victory from your last broadside, when in fact the enemy had quit the field before it was fired. I propose therefore two alternatives, each equally fair for both parties—take your choice. 1. After the stipulated number of letters of equal length shall have been exchanged of the controversy proper, each party shall write *one* of the same length in reviewing, summing up, and making the most he can for himself of the discussion, and these two last letters shall be published simultaneously (the time being before agreed upon) in our respective periodicals, neither of us seeing the last letter of his opponent till he has published his own. Or, 2. After the stipulated number of letters of the controversy proper shall have been exchanged, the first writer shall occupy, in review or reply, *one-half* the space of the last; the last shall then occupy *one-half the space of that;* the other again one-half of that, and so on till the length of the letters is reduced to half, or a quarter of a page of the Harbinger, so that no labored argument on either side should remain unnoticed.

In relation to your 5th rule, that the number of letters shall be limited to *twelve* on each side, I would prefer it should not be limited to so small a number: nevertheless, if you insist on it I will accede. I would prefer saying it shall not be *less* than *twelve* nor *more* than *twenty*, on each side: and either party shall have the privilege of closing the discussion at any intermediate number by giving the other notice in one letter that his *next* letter shall terminate the controversy proper, on his side.

Thus, sir, I dispose of the subject matter of your April letter. The work is fairly before you. Gird yourself then to the task. Remember, sir, you have "the sanctions" of your gospel to defend, and "nine feet of argument" to refute, and that, too, "spread over the whole face of the Atlantic."

I am, my dear sir, in earnest in this discussion. I do believe it to be an important one, and that, although feeble myself, my cause is strong, for truth is on my side. I hope you are also in earnest in your declared resolution fully to canvass the subject. But, sir, you have a hard task to perform. I really commiserate your condition—not because you are destitute of talents for the task; for I know of no man that has the requisite talents, if you have them not. In most of your former controversies, you have had greatly the advantage from the very ground you occupied: for you have contended on the one hand with sour and intolerant bigots, whether Protestant or Catholic, and on the other with cold and heartless sceptics, whose aim was to prostrate the dearest hopes of humanity. Of course you had the light of nature and revelation, the

Digitized by Google

voice of reason and humanity, the desires of all benevolent hearts and the prayers of all good men and angels on your side. But, now all these are against you. You have espoused the cause of endless malevolence, sin and misery, against that of endless and universal benevolence, holiness and happiness. Wonder not then if in fighting this battle, your arms are inverted and turned against yourself. In consideration of this your unhappy condition, I am willing to make every allowance that charity itself can suggest, and really hope your courage will not flag till you have at least tried what can be done.

I shall send you a copy of this (in proof) seven or eight days before it will be published in our paper, so as to afford you time to publish and answer it in your June number, which I really hope will be done, and that, henceforth, nothing will retard the progress of the discussion.

Yours very sincerely,

D. SKINNER.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER.

Dear Sir—YOUR favor reached me only per mail of yesterday, and today, the 30th May, I hand my reply to the compositor. Having delayed the June number more than one week, in constant expectation of your reply, we are much behind our regular date, and are now hasting to send you a proof of my letter by the mail of the 1st of June. We hope not to be again detained by your ill health during the pending discussion. You need not have 'seriously regretted my not sending you a copy of my letter to *Virginia* agreeable [agreeably] to your request,' till you knew what we had done and what letters we had received from you. Mr. *Arny*, my faithful clerk and deputy post-master, had mailed for you no less than *three* numbers of the M. H., besides one proof-sheet of my letter. All your directions were strictly obeyed. Your last letter received, requests, if *before such a date it should arrive here*, that a copy be sent you to Richmond: but your letter arrived not within the date prescribed—and therefore there was no fault, unless in obeying your instructions not to send after said date. So much for *sincere* regrets!

I have risen from the perusal of your epistle [No. 7.] with a higher esteem for your understanding, if not for your courteousness. Your compliance with my requests in stating the propositions to be discussed; your acceding to the evidence to be relied on; and in the main, your yielding to the rules to be observed, &c. shows that in your own good sense these preliminary arrangements are both necessary and proper. True, indeed, you comply not the most gracefully with these most reasonable requisitions. If you *sincerely* regarded these matters which are as universal as religious controversy, as "little quibbles and stratagems, those bandyings of words about challenges, new and multiform questions for debate, unnecessary laws of evidence, rules of discussion," &c. &c. why did you finally come up to all these "little quibbles," &c. and show that you felt that they were not what your words represent them! I cannot, then, sincerely thank you for your very *courteous* apology for me in making my demand 'an exception to my general character' of being "an honorable and high-minded Christian controversialist." I should *sincerely regret* for my reputation of being

Digitized by Google

"an honorable and high-minded Christian controversialist" before the American community, if these demands were to constitute "an exception to my general character." No, indeed, I have never undertaken, and, I think, shall never undertake, a formal discussion without *form*, without the propositions in writing—the rules of discussion, and the evidence to be relied on.

Of a piece with your querulous notes about quibbles, &c. are your third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs about challenges. You admit that I did not give any challenge in this case, and that Mr. Montgomery REQUESTED a discussion! and that you have accepted his place; and therefore I do not care whether you call it invitation, suggestion, request, demand, or *challenge*, so long as we understand whence it came and whither it aims. I choose to call it a challenge, and you may, as you are somewhat squeamish, call it "a *modest request*" on the part of Mr. Montgomery.

I received the other day a letter from Mr. *Spencer*, stating that I rightly viewed and represented his communication in my April letter to you; so that the challenge, or *modest inquiry* for a discussion, lies with Mr. Montgomery and the Universalists.

Your attempt at humor and wit in your strictures upon my gentle reprimand of Mr. Montgomery's 'modest inquiry,' is unworthy of a grave notice; for you evidently feel that it was uncalled for, and out of place. To such matters I will not reply. The pages of the past volumes of the Harbinger and the Christian Baptist will show how the Universalists have sought in years that are past to drag me into a controversy on their tenets.

You are still more unfortunate and unsuccessful in your attempt to apologize for your having begun to write before I returned from the Cincinnati discussion, or had time to respond to your letter of December 23d. You were informed that I left home in December, and in all courtesy I expected you would wait till you heard from me, or of my return from the Roman Catholic discussion, before you began the controversy. Equally impertinent to the case is your question, *Why did I not propose all the preliminaries to Mr. Montgomery?* with whom I had never concluded to have a discussion, only on an alternative never anticipated. In all these shiftings and writhings and subsequent concession of all that I demanded, you only the more emphatically impress upon every man of sense your evident mortification in having so informally, illogically, and lawlessly rushed into the arena. And yet you would do yourself the injustice to appear as vaingloriously attributing my demand for rules of discussion to the "horror-smiting" efficacy of your letter of February 10th.

If, indeed, my good friend, your letter had any thing to do with these propositions, I do most sincerely assure you that its impotency, rather than its potency—its headless, pointless, wide-spreading declamation, rather than its logic or authority, would have suggested to me the necessity of an attempt to control your wanderings by putting into your mouth the *bits* of logic, and by throwing around your neck the *reins* of reason. For, sir, I trust that I will yet (if you are candid) convince even yourself that there is not in said letter a single scripture quoted in its true meaning; or a single argument that will bear the line and plummet of sound sense and logical discretion. I know, sir, how Univer-

Digitized by Google

salists have generally managed their cause: but, if the Lord will, it shall not be so done with me on the present occasion. There must be something more solid than declamation, something more forcible than assertion, something more convincing than *ad captandum* appeals to the passions and sinister bias of ungodly men. But, sir, to conclude this point, all my discussions on important subjects are appealed to in disproof of all your excuses for yourself and your insinuations. My published debates are ample proof that I never engage in a debate without some propositions and rules of discussion. This fact alone dissipates all you have said on the "horror-smiting" impetus of your first epistle according to your esteem of it.

You say, "the discussion is opened:" certainly not by me! I therefore cannot conceive on what fair principle you object to my closing it. Do you expect to open and close it too! But, no, you ingeniously say, neither shall close it; and you offer two choices to prevent either of us from closing it. One is to let it flicker out, like the expiring wick, till it comes to half a page of the Harbinger!—a monosyllable a-piece!—The last words on each side, *Victory is mine!!* Do, then, let some other person shout it for you.

But, no, you will have each to write a *finale*, &c. to prevent—what? The bringing forth new arguments in the last speech. I will remove the reason for your alternatives, and of course you will not insist on such an unprecedented course. The rule is usual—it was observed by Bishop Purcell, Romish though he were, and without any demand on my part, save the reminding of him in my last speech of the oracle of reason and custom in such cases, which is, that *in the final address the respondent is not authorized to introduce new arguments or new topics.* I trust, then, this will be satisfactory to you, and that you will not claim first the choice of a written rather than an oral discussion—the choice of the propositions, and the choice of leading the way and of closing too!!! This is very honorable to Universalism, truly! You have made me respondent in the two first propositions, and yourself in the two last. I shall then expect that you conform to *universal* usage in all such cases, and allow me to respond to the close of the two last propositions.

I will split the difference with you as to the number of letters—say not less than twelve nor more than sixteen; and that he that wishes to extend it to16, shall intimate it at the close of the 11th. We shall call yours now before me the first, or if you will have it, yours of the 10th February shall be first. These important preliminaries being adjusted, and, as I hope, satisfactorily, may I not add, with them shall terminate all those trifles, which indeed are mere quibbles or manœuvres to save appearances, alike unmanly and undignified, and endeavor to interest our readers with matters more worthy of our pages and more deserving of their attention. I shall, with these wishes and expectations, proceed to the two propositions which you have sketched for me to affirm:—

1. You ask, "Are *sheol*, *hades*, and *gehenna*, (separately or together) ever used in the Scriptures to express a place or state of endless misery?" Without the imputation of any sinister design on your part to inveigle me by the verbiage of your first thesis, I must beg leave to object to it as not fairly expressing any point at issue: for three reasons:

1st. You ask, "Are these three words, separately or together, used in Scripture to express a state of endless misery." I answer, They are never used *together* at all for any purpose whatever.

Digitized by Google

2d. They are noun-substantives; and if fairly rendered, cannot express both the adjective *endless* and the substantive *misery*.

3d. In the third place, if the mere substantives *sheol, hades*, and *gehenna*, without any adjunct, did mean *endless* misery, or *eternal* woe, they would be insusceptible of the prefix *aionios*, or any other *adjective* signifying eternal: for surely *aionios hades* or *aionios gehenna, everlasting endless misery*, would be too pleonastic for either Hebrew or Greek prose!

But if I may be allowed to construct out of your materials a proposition which I can logically and scripturally affirm, and on which, if you please, a fair issue can be formed, I submit the following thesis:—*Sheol, hades, and gehenna are sometimes used in sacred Scripture to express a state of misery or punishment.*

I shall not fatigue you or my readers with unnecessary proofs or long displays on any point. Neither reason nor logic demands it. A few instances, well selected and well sustained, is all that I shall, in ordinary cases, allege.

The proof in the case of *sheol* and *hades*. Psalm ix. 17. "The wicked shall be turned into hell (*sheol*) and all the nations that forget God." The Septuagint of this passage is, "The wicked shall be turned into hell (*hades*) and all the nations that forget God." Mr. Balfour, who gives his 64 *sheols* from the Old Testament, says it is rendered by our translators three times *pit*, twenty-nine times *grave*, and thirty-two times *hell*. Grant it all: he also admits that *hades* is the fair and full Greek representative of *sheol*. Of course whatever the one signifies the other also signifies. This is as generally true in this case, as perhaps in any other. Well, then, in Psalm ix. 17. both *hades* and *sheol* represent not simply the *grave*, but hell or punishment. Can any one of an unbiased judgment imagine that here it simply means the grave? Then what is the difference between saying, "The wicked," &c. and the righteous shall be turned into hell and all the nations who remember God! This, on his hypothesis, is as true as what David said!!

Prov. xxiii. 13, 14. "Withhold not correction from thy child: for if thou beatest him with the rod he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shall deliver his soul from *hell*," (sheol,) destruction or punishment, not simply the grave: for as dieth the worthless youth so dieth the virtuous.

Luke xvi. 23. "The rich man died, and in hell (*hades*) he lifted up his eyes being in torment." Surely this is unequivocal proof that sheol, and *hades* its Greek representative, sometimes indicate a state of misery or punishment, which is all that I affirm.

It would indeed be supremely absurd, and no scholar ever did affirm, that either *sheol* or *hades* did necessarily signify *endless* misery; because sheol or hades is to be destroyed. Thus speaks John: "Death and hell (hades) were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death." Rev. xx.

You ought, my dear sir, to have added to these two the word *tartarus*, translated *hell* by the King's authority, and have left out *gehenna* for another category. It occurs but once; but it is in such a context as stereotypes its meaning. "If," says Peter, (2d epis. ii. 4.) "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, (tartarus) and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Tartarus, then, represents that prison in hades in which Dives was tormented, and into which the wicked dead are "turned" where they are confined to the judgment of the great day.

But *gehenna* is a part of the subject of your proposition, and of course included in the predicate. Gehenna is a purely Hebrew word, com-

Digitized by Google

pounded of *Ge* and *Hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, sometimes called Tophet, and fully described Jeremiah 19th ch. and 7th ch. v. 29th to the end. All intelligent Christians, long before the days of Universalism, knew that this valley was in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem; that "here the children of Israel greatly sinned in the cruel and abominable sacrifices offered to the idol god Moloch; that a constant fire was kept up in this place; and therefore no place could convey to a Jew a more lively view of misery and wretchedness than the valley of Hinnom. The torments inflicted in the valley of Hinnom, until the days of the Spanish Inquisition, were the most cruel in the annals of time. Hence it was first conspicuous as a place of temporal misery. Now if the future punishment of evil doers should be set forth in human language, there was not, in all its wealth and fulness, any one term more fit to express it than the term *gehenna* That it literally denoted a place of punishment, will not be controverted by you, sir, any more than by Mr. Balfour; but that, like *heaven, paradise,* and many other important words, it began to be used figuratively as the doctrine of a future life was opened to the human understanding. That in the Scriptures it denotes future punishment, a punishment very different from that in the valley of Hinnom, is, I think, very evident from *every place* in which it is found in the New Testament: for in no case does it refer to the valley of Hinnom only as an illustration of a severer sentence, and this but once. But it is only necessary to my purpose that I prove that it sometimes denotes a state of misery or of punishment other than the literal flames of the valley of Hinnom. Of the twelve places in which it is found in the New Testament, every one might be appealed to; but, as my method is, I will cite one or two. Scribes and Pharisees, "how can you escape the damnation of *hell?* (gehenna)—certainly not the fire of Tophet, or of the literal Gehenna. Matth. xxiii. 33. Again—"Fear not them," says the Great Teacher, "fear not them who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but fear him who when he has killed the body, has power to destroy both soul and body in hell," (*gehenna*) Matth. x. 28. also, Luke xii. 5. Does not this unquestionably denote future punishment? Hell, a Saxon word, be it observed, was once as rich in meaning, as sheol, hades, tartarus, and gehenna; for all these words have been translated by it. Hence *hell* signified once—the grave, the separate state, or the invisible world, and future punishment. Since the conflicts about purgatory, it has, for nearly two centuries, by the Protestant world, been exclusively appropriated to the place or state of future punishment of wicked men. This being generally admitted by Universalists, I need not dwell upon it. The context alone is therefore the sovereign arbiter of the precise import of *sheol, hades,* and *hell,* in any given place. *Gehenna and Tartarus are never used but to denote punishment.* They were two thousand years ago as firmly fixed to that sense, as the word *hell* is now amongst the Christians of the present day. If I mistake not, Universalists admit this; consequently *sheol* and its representative *hades* never did, in the estimation of learned Christians, include more than that portion of the future state lying between the last breath and the first blast of the archangel's trumpet —the interval between death and judgment, or the state bounded by these two events. Therefore, they include both Tartarus and Paradise, the righteous and the wicked dead; and consequently only *sometimes* can they represent punishment; and for one great reason assigned, never can signify *eternal* or *endless* punishment. *It is the province and the power of other words, adjuncts, and phrases to teach punishment without end.* And when we shall have disposed of your *three verbal* propositions, this will, we have little doubt, be apparent to our most candid readers.

Digitized by Google

It avails nothing for you or your party to reply that *Gehenna* was the name of a place which once denoted temporal punishment or any inferior punishment, and for that reason cannot represent misery of the most exquisite kind. This, I am aware, is a very fashionable species of logic amongst Universalists; but it wants alike the authority of the Bible and the laws of language. The Hebrew *Shemim*, the Greek *Ouranos*, and their English representative *heavens*, have all a literal and local meaning. They denote the regions of air, the expanse sometimes called firmament. Shall we thence affirm that in the universe there is no other heaven than the air, or the sky, the azure vault, because the word *heaven* first of all had this sense and no other! Is not this the pith of the ten thousand columns written by your brethren upon the word Gehenna! I will not, however, anticipate you: but, to save our paper and time, as well as the property of our readers, I will remind you and them, in confirmation of the above important fact that speaks volumes, that the Persian word *Paradise*, once the name of that garden of Eden planted by God for the home of our first parents, (and also the name of the Persian Elysium,) continued not to be literally appropriated to that spot, any more than *Gehenna* to the valley of Hinnom. In the beautiful and bold imagery of Eastern style, it was soon transferred to the blissful abodes of happy spirits in the future world. So that Jesus promised the penitent thief a visit with him to Paradise; and Paul, caught away into Paradise, was so entranced that he never could tell whether he was in the body or out of the body till the day of his death But this he remembered, that in Paradise he saw and heard things unspeakable in all the tongues of earth. *Query*—Were the penitent thief and the entranced Paul carried into the Persian Paradise, or to Adam's garden in Eden! Why, then, circumscribe the word Gehenna to the valley of Hinnom!!!

Gehenna, then, like the words *heaven* and *paradise*, and many others, became at length, according to the universal law of language, the instituted sign and name of a state of future punishment of the most terrific and appalling character—just as *heaven* and *paradise* in process of time became the instituted names and signs of future and eternal bliss. Mr. Balfour has in one volume given 254 pages on Gehenna. I can take his own logic and criticism, and in half the number prove there is no heaven.

From the proof already offered, may I not then conclude that *sheol* and *hades*, *sometimes*, and *Gehenna* and *Tartarus generally*, if not always, in the same style, denote future punishment or misery, which is all that was proposed to be demonstrated in my first proposition.

The 2d proposition which you allege for me you have thus expressed: "Do the words *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, &c. when applied to the punishment of the wicked, mean duration without end?"

Even here you are too loose and illogical for my taste. I value my veracity at a higher rate than to affirm the truth of any proposition that ends with *and so forth*, &c. I have indeed heard of a person under oath, finishing his testimony with &c. &c. "and so forth, and so forth;" but then he was not a limitarian, and of course his example could not be obligatory upon me in this case. From the verbiage of your proposition I infer that you admit, first, that the wicked are punished, and that this punishment is future; for in this proposition you only deny that the words *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, &c. when applied to the punishment of the wicked, mean that their punishment shall endure without end. You admit, moreover, and I am glad to observe it, that *there are other words which denote the punishment of the wicked besides sheol, hadee, gehenna;* for you can no where find *olem*, *aion*, or *aionos* applied to *sheol*, *hades*, or *gehenna!!* You must then, on your own showing, affirm my first proposition, or you must admit that there are other words than Tartarus and Gehenna, which express the punishment of the wicked; for, in the name of reason, why deny that *olem*, *aion*, and *aionos*, "when applied to the punishment of the wicked," mean endless duration, if they are never so applied! Now, sir, before I affirm or deny the second proposition, I request of you a list of those passages where *olem*, *aion*, and *aionos* are applied to the punishment of the wicked, and then I will undertake to show that in such places *olem*, *aion*, and *aionos* do mean duration without end. You certainly must be well acquainted with those passages where the punishment of the wicked is defined by such words, as you inform the public that you are prepared to show that in none of these passages do these words signify duration without end; or, that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless. You will please be very precise in your enumeration of all those passages in which the punishment of the wicked is set forth in other terms than *sheol*, *hades*, *tartarus*, *gehenna*, and especially those places where *olem*, *aion*, and *aionos* are applied to these words, or those other words which express the punishment of the wicked. Should you fail here, yourself and friends will appear in rather an unenviable attitude in the two propositions which you have agreed to negate and annul.

The concluding paragraphs of your epistle are reserved for another occasion. The sequel will, perhaps, furnish the best comment upon them Confidence in one's self, or in the goodness of one's cause, and the swaggering style of gasconade, are weak logic and easily rebutted. But, my good sir, the dignity of the cause which I espouse commands a dignified defence, and therefore I cannot descend to the playfulness or frivolity of every smart and piquant expression, which, in the exuberance of your fancy, you may deem amusing to your readers.

Since you have demanded the discussion of three propositions about words, and only one upon the thing itself, I will aim at the utmost brevity in the support of those two propositions which I affirm; so that we may be detained for as short a time as possible in the por-

Digitized by Google

tico of the discussion. I already perceive that your own scheme will comprehend all the points suggested in my April letter.

This communication exceeds 6 pages *burgeois*, because we are still on the preliminaries, and because you yet occupy in the Harbinger some pages in advance of me. When we are equal in words or in space, and when the preliminaries (as I trust they will be in your next) are approbated by you and finally concluded, we shall be circumscribed to the six pages proposed; for reasons already suggested.——With all due respect, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

News from the Churches.

ATHENS, Cook county, Ill., April 27, 1837.

Knowing your editorial duties to be diversified and arduous in the extreme, I would not trouble you with this, were I not also aware that any information on the subject of religion would be gladly received by you, and obtain from you all that attention which the importance of the subject demands. Allow me, then, to trespass so far on your time as to give you a brief and imperfect account of the moral condition of this part of the country and the state of Christianity here: in so doing, I regret to say, I am not able to give you so full or so flattering an account as you may perhaps anticipate, or as I could wish.

Having only resided in this country a little over six months, my observations have been limited to a small district of the country, and to that district these remarks are more particularly intended to apply, though by what information I have been able to collect, they will, with some few exceptions, be equally applicable to all the north part of the state.

On arriving in this country, a stranger will be immediately struck with the exceeding immorality of the inhabitants, especially in the towns. Religion seems to occupy but a small share of the attention of a small part of the people. The rage for speculation has almost annihilated every other consideration from their minds. The success which some individuals meet in suddenly acquiring fortunes acts like magic on others, and stimulates them with anticipation and the hope that they may be equally fortunate. The result of this state of things is what I have stated. Christianity is almost wholly left in the back ground.

In Chicago there are small societies of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, and larger ones of Catholics and Episcopalians. Here and there, among the scattering settlements, you will meet with individual members of the various sects, and in some of them organized societies: but they are "few and far between." I would observe, however, that what little morality exists here, is mostly among the agricultural class remote from the towns. These being mostly from the eastern states, and not having been so much exposed to contagion, have not thrown off the restraints which bound them there.

Since I have been in the country I have only met two persons who have espoused the cause of the reformation, thirty miles from here. This is different from what I had anticipated. Even many who had never heard that such a reformation was in progress! In the south I am told the brethren are more numerous.

Digitized by Google

This state of society cannot long exist. This country is beginning to attract the attention of the Christian philanthropist, as well as the speculator. Each of the sects will, of course, strive to plant their creeds as extensively as possible in a soil so prolific. Now seems to be the favorable moment for disseminating the truth, while the minds of the people are unshackled and not pre-occupied by principles at variance with the primitive simplicity of the gospel. Ere long, however, the scene will be changed, for the proselyting machinery is beginning to move, and will doubtless soon be in full and successful operation.

What distraction might not be saved to this interesting country by having the truth planted now, while in its infancy. Oh! that some of the brethren would take this subject into consideration, and "come over into Macedonia and help us." DAVID CORY.

[Cannot, will not some brother who has an eye to the recompense at the resurrection o the just, turn his course in the above direction?——A. C.]

Besides various communications from the churches, some Queries on the Diakonate and the Episcopate, Notices of new Publications, and some other matters in type, intended for this number, have been laid over to make room for the Discussion of Universalism, Mr. Skinner's letter arriving just in time to displace those articles. It will require the utmost despatch in our replies to have an article on this subject in every number, which no doubt our readers expect. A. C.

From the Episcopal Recorder.

COGITANDUM.—It is a common lamentation, "*I have but little time to read!*" I answer, We need but little time for this purpose; and subjoin with confidence, He that finds *much time to read*, will not attain any great store of knowledge. *Knowledge* he may have; but an *intellection of things as they are*, must be sought for in a different way.

An outline of that "more excellent way" is as follows:—*Know thyself*, "for only what we have within us, that can we see without." *Acquaint thyself with God*, by the study of his works and his word—both being accompanied with fervent prayer, and full reliance upon Him as the inspirer of all wisdom for the created mind

Universally study *subjects*, not *books*. If books can assist, very well; but there is only *one volume* that may be our master; and in learning from this instructor, we must be careful to *understand* his teachings. His language is sometimes misapprehended, to the no small prejudice of the truth. VERBUM SAP.

NEW CONVERTS.—A Roman Catholic Missionary among the American Indians, writing to his patrons in Austria, says—"All these presents are very seasonable and acceptable to my church and my new converts, and many of the articles, as church attire, holy images, and beads are not to be had in this country even for money. The converted Indians have so great a desire and reverence for these things, that they will have them; and if one of them loses his beads or his little cross, he comes to the missionary to get another. On this account I need a vast many of these articles."

How successful must have been the labors of this missionary! We presume that a keg of red lead and a choice sample of scalping knives would have been equally acceptable to these new converts.—*Presbyt'n.*

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER VII.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *July*, 1837.

MR. LYND ON THE INFLUENCES OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

MY friend Mr. Lynd, president of one of the Baptist churches in Cincinnati, has favored me with a few well-written and well-digested remarks on my views of the influences of the Holy Spirit. His letter, a part of which we now present to our readers, addressed one month since to Mr. Stevens, editor of the Baptist Cross & Journal, from the dignified manner in which it treats the subject, demands from me a respectful attention.

With great brevity I offer a few remarks on that part of the letter now quoted. As my manner is, our readers shall have both sides:—

"*Brother Stevens*—I received a few days since the fourth number of the Millennial Harbinger, sent to me by the editor, with his respects. Though I am not a reader of this periodical, yet I am not ignorant of Mr. Campbell's religious opinions. I have examined with care his work called "*Christianity Restored*," in which are many things that commend themselves to the attention of all Christians. Still, if I comprehend the language of the author, there are some things to condemn; some points of vital importance in the gospel system, in which, it appears to me, he has fearfully erred, and departed from the faith delivered to the saints. From the number of the Harbinger sent to me, I should infer that Mr. Campbell is anxious to produce the impression that he has been misrepresented in his views. And whether designedly or not, during his recent visit to this city, he did produce this impression upon several who had before regarded him as being in error. They have freely expressed the opinion, that Mr. Campbell has changed his ground, and become an orthodox Baptist. The impression might have resulted from their own inattention, or from the excitement of their feelings in his favor, growing out of the Catholic controversy. I take it for granted that his views are definitely stated in "*Christianity Restored*," for he has not publicly disavowed the sentiments therein contained. Taking this for our text-book, it can be proved that Mr. Campbell has not been misrepresented in his *main positions*.

Digitized by Google

"With your permission I will lay before the readers of the Cross and Journal, his views on the influence of the Holy Spirit.

"That there may be no possibility of misrepresenting, I will quote his own words in the dialogue between Austin and Timothy, commencing at the 343d page. He observes, 'We have two sorts of power, physical and moral. By the former we operate upon matter—by the latter, upon mind. To put matter in motion we use physical power, whether we call it animal or scientific power; to put minds in motion, we use arguments or motives, addressed to the reason and nature of man.' Again, he says—'All the moral power which can be exerted on human beings, is, and must of necessity be, in the arguments addressed to them. No other power than moral power can operate on minds; and this power must always be clothed in words, addressed to the eye or ear. Thus we reason when revelation is altogether out of view. And when we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted upon minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine that that power can consist in any thing else but words or arguments.'

"Again he says—'Whenever a person has expressed all the arguments he has to offer to carry one point, he has spent all his moral strength, whether he carries that point or not. But until all his arguments are stated, heard, and understood, his moral power is not fully developed.'

"When, in this dialogue, Austin asks the question—'Do you allege that the Holy Spirit can exert no greater influence upon the human mind, than is found in the arguments which are written in the New Testament?' he replies, in the person of Timothy, '*I do, provided always, that the arguments are understood.*'

"The following sentence is printed in *italics*—'*As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power in the words which it fills with its ideas; so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power in the words which it fills with its ideas.*' To this he adds—'If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments; or if the New and Old Testament contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent; and he that is not sanctified and saved by these, cannot be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine.' Once more, he says—'We plead that *all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine Record.*'

"Now who dare say that on the subject of divine influence Mr. Campbell has been misrepresented? He may say, in so many words, that he believes the influence of the Holy Spirit to be necessary in renewing and sanctifying the heart of a sinner; but his *opinion*, as above expressed, is a direct denial of the influence of the Holy Spirit, as it has been understood by the great mass of Christians. Mr. Campbell would not attempt to deny the *fact* that the Spirit of God exercises an influence upon the human mind, in renewing and sanctifying men, because it is most plainly revealed. He admits the fact, but is not *satisfied* with the simple fact. He must superadd his own *opinion* concerning the kind of influence exerted. Other professed believers, not of his communion, are satisfied with the *fact*, and confess that they are unable to comprehend the mode of operation; but Mr. Campbell, whose professed object

Digitized by Google

is to unite men upon the cardinal facts of Christianity, makes his own *opinion* a prominent part of his system.

"The difficulty, then, does not lie in the *fact*. Nor does it exist in the *instrumentality*. For it is acknowledged that the instrumentality through which the Holy Spirit operates upon the human mind, is the *truth* which God has revealed. The Apostle Paul writes to Timothy, "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." The Apostle James says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth. And the Apostle Peter says, "Being begottten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever"

"The question which causes the difficulty is this—'*What kind of power or influence does the Holy Spirit employ?*'

"There are two kinds of power which men can employ upon men. The one is *physical* power, or what we mean by the term *force*. But this kind of influence is utterly exploded by all consistent Christians, in relation to the renewing and sanctifying of the heart. The other is a *moral* power, which consists in the influence of ideas presented to the mind. In other words, we exercise *moral* power over each other by *motive* and *argument*. The question then is—Does the Holy Spirit renew and sanctify the hearts of men by this kind of power alone; i. e. *moral power*, contained in his words and arguments, or by an influence superadded to moral power?

"One point must be well fixed in the mind, and that is, that some truths are revealed which are beyond our comprehension. For instance, it is revealed that Deity is *one;* yet Deity is represented as existing in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Father, the Holy Spirit is not the Father nor the Son. If we were required to define *unity* in regard to divine existence, we must plead ignorance. We know nothing of the nature or essence of the divine being. It may be said that if we cannot form a clear idea of the divine unity, we cannot think of it, or speak of it intelligibly. We plead guilty to the charge. We may be fools for our belief; but still Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are *one God*.

"The Holy Spirit operated upon the minds of the Apostles to bring all things to remembrance which the Saviour had taught them, and to enable them to speak in languages which they had never learned. If we were required to define the nature of the Spirit's influence in these cases, we should confess our ignorance. It was something different from our views of physical and moral power, and consequently we cannot define it. Mr. Campbell says that, in primitive times, "*a whole congregation expressed all the same words at the same instant, the Holy Spirit suggesting to each individual all the same ideas and expressions, at one and the same impulse.*" If we are asked to define this kind of influence, we cannot. We know it was not *physical*, for it had relation to mental operations. We know it was not *moral*, for neither words nor actions addressed to the ear and the eye, were employed. We cannot produce such results in men, either by *physical* or *moral* power, and yet these are the only kinds of power we can define and employ. If, then, the Holy Spirit could suggest to the minds of a whole congregation at the same instant, the same ideas and expressions, we cannot doubt his

Digitized by Google

power to give to divine truth an impression upon the mind which it could not have independently of such power. Suppose we cannot define the nature of this power, will that prove that there is no such power in the universe? Our Lord exhibits a certain operation which no man can define, unless the Saviour made a mistake. He says, 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' "

I shall sincerely thank Mr. Lynd or any other gentleman, who will enumerate those "points of vital importance in the gospel system," in which I have "fearfully erred," and then convince me of the error; and I do promise him they shall be instantly renounced. Mr. Lynd is right in saying that I am "anxious to produce the impression that I have been misrepresented in my views." I have, indeed, (as all other persons that have ever said *Reform*,) been very grievously misrepresented, and, to this hour, in spite of all I can say, am yet often most grossly misconceived. Even Mr. Lynd himself does not seem fully to comprehend the extracts which he has just quoted from the dialogue; for he says the *opinion* as above expressed is a "direct denial of the influence of the Holy Spirit as it has been understood by the great mass of Christians." I wish, indeed, the great mass of Christians had any clear and distinct understanding on the subject. But Mr. Lynd, I think, fails to prove that this is true of his own opinions as expressed in the above letter, as the sequel may show.

Mr. Lynd, however, agrees with me in the *fact* that "the Spirit of God exercises an influence upon the human mind in renewing and sanctifying men." He also agrees with me in the *instrumentality*—that the Holy Spirit "operates upon the human mind through the *truth* which God has revealed." The difficulty, then, he says, and he says correctly, does not lie in the *fact*, nor in the instrumentality, but in an opinion concerning the kind of power or influence which the Holy Spirit employs. It is, then, a speculative difference about an opinion; and is this difference of vital importance? If so, then it should be clearly comprehended; for is there any vital point which cannot be comprehended? Be it then observed—

1. That I do not superadd my opinion about the kind of power to the fact or the instrumentality, as of any importance to the salvation of any human being. I beg leave to state emphatically, that I do not 'make my own opinion a prominent part of the system of truth.'

2. But does not My. Lynd superadd his opinion about the kind of power or influence to the facts and instrumentality; and because of some alleged discrepancy between us, believe and represent me as grievously erring in some "vital point."

Digitized by Google

3. Mr. Lynd admits that he "cannot comprehend the mode of operation."

Putting, then, his three admissions together—1st. that we agree in the fact—2d. in the instrumentality—and 3d. that he cannot comprehend the mode of operation, how can he understand me as holding an opinion upon a subject which he cannot comprehend, of such fearful error as to constitute "a departure from the faith delivered to the saints"! He cannot even find a name for the power or influence for which he pleads. Now, who ever understood a subject for which he could not find a name? We admit the mode of the divine existence is incomprehensible; but this is a question about the nature of a power, not of a mode of being; and it will never suffice, in the eye of reason or philosophy, to make the incomprehensibility of one doctrine a proof that another in debate is incomprehensible, and that therefore our views must necessarily be correct.

But we shall reserve the other half of the aforesaid letter for our next number. Meanwhile I pray with David, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law," (or gospel;) "make me to understand the way of thy precepts: so shall I talk of thy wondrous works. Teach me, O Lord! the way of thy statutes, and I shall keep it unto the end." Mr. Lynd concurs with me in this practice. We are, then, *practically* agreed, however theoretically he may suppose, we differ. I have no faith in any gospel that dispenses with prayer, with the need of divine influence, or with the consolations that arise from communion with God our Father, through Jesus Christ our Lord, and by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit. A. C.

A DEFENCE OF THE USE OF THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.

The greatest moral powers on earth are the family circle and the common school. United in one system of culture, they are almost omnipotent in the formation of human character. The bar, the senate, the pulpit are impotent in any warfare against the nurse and the school-master. Mothers and school-mistresses, when allied to kindred fathers and school-masters, are an over-match against all the sages, lawyers, philosophers, orators, and judges in the land. A few individuals, perhaps one in ten thousand, are awaking to a rational estimate of that overwhelming power for good or ill which has hitherto been comparatively slighted and neglected. Who of us at this moment could tell what might be accomplished in one century in a community where the family and common school system of education were in unison with proper

Digitized by Google

views of human nature, its capacities, susceptibilities, and powers intellectual and moral? A race of beings vastly superior to the present, in all that is physical, intellectual, and moral, would be the result. Every society on earth is moulded and colored by these two institutions. Athens, Rome, Jerusalem, Damascus, Canton, London, in every century of their existence, and in all their vast extremes of character, are but proofs of this.

There must be a thorough and very general reformation in this department; and very speedily, or as a community we will greatly degenerate. On this subject we must be copious at no very distant day. Family piety, and the Bible as a school-book, are topics very dear to us. Meanwhile, I present to my readers, in lieu of an essay which I designed on that subject, the following letter from one of America's greatest and best men. The name of BENJAMIN RUSH stands on the Declaration of Independence. This essay does him greater honor. A. C.

Dear Sir—It is now several months since I promised to give you my reasons for preferring the Bible, as a school-book, to all other compositions. Before I state my arguments, I shall assume the five following propositions:—

1. That Christianity is the only true and perfect religion; and that, in proportion as mankind adopt its principles, and obey its precepts, they will be wise and happy.

2. That a better knowledge of this religion is to be acquired by reading the Bible, than in any other way.

3. That the Bible contains more knowledge necessary to man in his present state, than any other book in the world.

4. That knowledge is most durable, and religious instruction most useful, when imparted in early life.

5. That the Bible, when not read in schools, is seldom read in any subsequent period of life.

My arguments in favor of the use of the Bible as a school book, are founded,

1st. *In the constitution of the human mind.*

1. The *memory* is the first faculty which opens in the minds of children. Of how much consequence, then, must it be, to impress it with the great truths of Christianity, before it is pre-occupied with less interesting subjects!

2. There is a peculiar aptitude in the minds of children for *religious knowledge.* I have constantly found them, in the first six or seven years of their lives, more inquisitive upon religious subjects than upon any others. And an ingenious instructer of youth has informed me, that he has found young children more capable of receiving just ideas upon the most difficult tenets of religion, than upon the most simple branches of human knowledge. It would be strange if it were otherwise; for God creates all his means to suit all his ends. There must, of course, be a fitness between the human mind and the truths which are essential to its happiness.

3. The influence of *early impressions* is very great upon subsequent

Digitized by Google

life; and in a world where *false* prejudices do so much mischief, it would discover great weakness not to oppose them by such as are *true*. I grant that many men have rejected the impressions derived from the Bible; but, how much soever these impressions may have been despised, I believe no man was ever early instructed in the truths of the Bible, without having been made *wiser* or *better* by the early operation of these impressions upon his mind. Every just principle that is to be found in the writings of Voltaire, is borrowed from the Bible; and the morality of the Deists, which has been so much admired and praised where it has existed, has been, I believe, in most cases, the effect of habits produced by early instruction in the principles of Christianity.

4. We are subject, by a general law in our natures, to what is called *habit*. Now if the Scriptures be necessary to our happiness any time of our life, the sooner we begin to read them the more we shall probably be attached to them; for it is peculiar to all the acts of habit, to become easy, strong, and agreeable by repetition.

5. It is a law in our natures, that we remember longest the knowledge we acquire by the *greatest number of our senses*. Now a knowledge of the contents of the Bible is acquired in school by the aid of the *eye* and the *ear;* for children, after getting their lessons, read or repeat them to their instructers in an audible voice; of course there is a presumption that this knowledge will be retained much longer than if it had been acquired in any other way.

6. The interesting events and characters recorded and described in the Old and New Testaments, are calculated, above all others, to seize upon all the faculties of the minds of children. The understanding, the memory, the imagination, the passions, and the moral powers, are all occasionally addressed by the various incidents which are contained in those divine books, insomuch that not to be delighted with them, is to be devoid of every principle of pleasure that exists in a sound mind.

7. There is a native love of *truth* in the human mind. Lord Shaftesbury says that "truth is so congenial to our minds that we love the very *shadow* of it;" and Horace, in his rules for composing an epic poem, establishes the same law in our natures, by advising that "fictions in poetry should resemble truth." Now the Bible contains more truth than any other book in the world: so true is the testimony that it bears of God in his works of creation, providence, and redemption, that it is called *truth itself*, by way of pre-eminence above other things that are acknowledged to be true. How forcibly are we struck with the evidences of truth, in the history of the Jews, above what we discover in the history of other nations! Where do we find a hero or a historian record his own faults or vices, except in the Old Testament? Indeed, my friend, from some accounts which I have read of the American Revolution, I begin to grow sceptical to all history except that which is contained in the Bible. Now if this book be known to contain nothing but what is materially true, the mind will naturally acquire a love for it from this circumstance; and from this affection for the truths of the Bible, it will acquire a discernment of truth in other books, and a preference of it in all the transactions of life.

8. There is a wonderful property in the *memory*, which enables it *in old age to recover* the knowledge acquired in early life, after it had been apparently forgotten for forty or fifty years. Of how much consequence,

Digitized by Google

then, must it be to fill the mind with that species of knowledge in childhood and youth, which, when *recalled* in the decline of life, will support the soul under the infirmities of age, and smooth the avenues of approaching death? The Bible is the only book which is capable of affording this support to old age; and it is for this reason that we find it resorted to with so much diligence and pleasure by such old people as have read it in early life. I can recollect many instances of this kind in persons who discovered no special attachment to the Bible in the meridian of their days, who have, notwithstanding, spent the evening of life in reading no other book. The late Sir John Pringle, physician to the Queen of Great Britain, after passing a long life in camps and at court, closed it by studying the Scriptures. So anxious was he to increase his knowledge in them, that he wrote to Dr. Michaelis, a learned professor of divinity in Germany, for an explanation of a difficult text of Scripture, a short time before his death.

II. My second argument in favor of the use of the Bible in schools, is founded upon an *implied command of God, and upon the practice of several of the wisest nations of the world.* In the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy we find the following words, which are directly to my purpose: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart. And thou *shalt teach them diligently unto thy children*, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

It appears, moreover, from the history of the Jews, that they flourished as a nation in proportion as they honored and read the books of Moses, which contained the only revelation that God had made to the world. The law was not only neglected, but lost, during the general profligacy of manners which accompanied the long and wicked reign of Manasseh. But the discovery of it in the rubbish of the Temple, by Josiah, and its subsequent general use, were followed by a return of national virtue and prosperity. We read further of the wonderful effects which the reading of the law by Ezra, after his return from his captivity in Babylon, had upon the Jews. They hung upon his lips with tears, and showed the sincerity of their repentance by their general reformation.

The learning of the Jews, for many years, consisted in nothing but a knowledge of the Scriptures. These were the text-books of all the instruction that was given in the schools of their Prophets. It was by means of this general knowledge of their law, that those Jews who wandered from Judea into other countries, carried with them, and propagated certain ideas of the true God among all the civilized nations upon the face of the earth. And it was from the attachment they retained to the Old Testament, that they procured a translation of it into the Greek language, after they had lost the Hebrew tongue by their long absence from their native country. The utility of this translation, commonly called the Septuagint, in facilitating the progress of the gospel, is well known to all who are acquainted with the history of the first age of the Christian church.

But the benefits of an early and general acquaintance with the Bible were not confined to the Jewish nations: they have appeared in many countries in Europe since the Reformation. The industry and habits of

Digitized by Google

order which distinguish many of the German nations, are derived from their early instruction in the principles of Christianity by means of the Bible. In Scotland, and in parts of New England, where the Bible has been long used as a school-book, the inhabitants are among the most enlightened in religion and science, the most strict in morals, and the most intelligent in human affairs, of any people whose history has come to my knowledge upon the surface of the globe.

I wish to be excused for repeating here, that if the Bible did not convey a single direction for the attainment of future happiness, it should be read in our schools in preference to all other books, from its containing the greatest portion of that kind of knowledge which is calculated to produce private and public temporal happiness.

We err, not only in human affairs, but in religion likewise, *only* because we not "know the Scriptures" and obey their instructions. Immense truths, I believe, are concealed in them. The time, I have no doubt, will come, when posterity will view and pity our ignorance of these truths, as much as we do the ignorance sometimes manifested by the disciples of our Saviour, who knew nothing of the meaning of those plain passages in the Old Testament which were daily fulfilling before their eyes.

But further, we err, not only in religion but in philosophy likewise, because we "do not know or *believe* the Scriptures." The sciences have been compared to a circle, of which religion composes a part. To understand any one of them perfectly, it is necessary to have a knowledge of them all. Bacon, Boyle, and Newton included the Scriptures in the inquiries to which their universal geniuses disposed them, and their philosophy was aided by their knowledge in them. A striking agreement has been lately discovered between the history of certain events recorded in the Bible, and some of the operations and productions of nature, particularly those which are related in Whitehurst's observations on the deluge, in Smith's account of the origin of the variety of color in the human species, and in Bruce's travels. It remains yet to be shown how many other events related in the Bible, accord with some late important discoveries in the principles of medicine. The events and the principles alluded to, mutually establish the truth of each other.

I shall now proceed to ANSWER SOME OF THE OBJECTIONS which have been made to the use of the Bible as a school-book:—

1. We are told that the familiar use of the Bible in our schools has a tendency to *lessen a due reverence for it*. This objection, by proving too much, proves nothing at all. If familiarity lessens respect for divine things, then all those precepts of our religion which enjoin the daily or weekly worship of the Deity, are improper. The Bible was not intended to represent a Jewish ark; and it is an anti-Christian idea to suppose that it can be profaned by being carried into a school-house, or by being handled by children. But where will the Bible be read by young people with more reverence than in a school? Not in most private families; for I believe there are few parents who preserve so much order in their houses as is kept in the common English schools.

2. We are told that the greatest part of the Old Testament is no way interesting to mankind under the present dispensation of the gospel. But I deny that any of the books of the Old Testament are not interest-

Digitized by Google

ing to mankind under the gospel dispensation. Most of the characters, events, and ceremonies mentioned in them, are personal, providential, or instituted types of the Messiah; all of which have been, or remain yet to be fulfilled by him. It is from an ignorance or neglect of these types that we have so many Deists in Christendom; for so irrefragably do they prove the truth of Christianity, that I am sure a young man who had been regularly instructed in their meaning, could never doubt afterward of the truth of any of its principles. If any obscurity appears in these principles, it is only (to use the words of the poet) because *they are dark with excessive brightness.*

I know there is an objection among many people to teaching children doctrines of any kind, because they are liable to be controverted. But where will this objection lead us? The being of a God, and the obligations of morality have both been controverted; and yet, who has objected to our teaching these doctrines to our children?

The curiosity and capacities of young people for the mysteries of religion, awaken much sooner than is generally supposed Of this, we have two remarkable proofs in the Old Testament. The first is mentioned in the twelfth chapter of Exodus: "And it shall come to pass when your *children* shall say unto you, *What mean ye by this service?* that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses And the children of Israel went away, and did as the Lord had commanded Moses and Aaron." A second proof of the desire of children to be instructed in the mysteries of religion, is to be found in the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy: "And when thy son *asketh* thee in the time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments which the Lord our God hath commanded you? Then thou shalt say unto thy son, We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt, and the Lord our God brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand." These inquiries from the mouths of children are perfectly natural; for where is the parent who has not similar questions proposed to him by his children, upon their being first conducted to a place of worship, or upon their beholding, for the first time, either of the sacraments of our religion?

Let us not be wiser than our Maker. If moral precepts alone could have reformed mankind, the mission of the Son of God into our world would have been unnecessary. He came to promulgate a system of *doctrines*, as well as a system of morals. The perfect morality of the gospel rests upon a *doctrine* which, though often controverted, has never been refuted—I mean the vicarious life and death of the Son of God. This sublime and ineffable doctrine delivers us from the absurd hypothesis of modern philosophers, concerning the foundation of moral obligation, and fixes it upon the eternal and self-moving principle of LOVE. It concentrates a whole system of ethics in a single text of Scripture—"*A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you.*" By withholding the knowledge of this doctrine from children, we deprive ourselves of the best means of awakening moral sensibility in their minds. We do more; we furnish an argument for withholding from them a knowledge of the morality of the gospel likewise; for this, in many instances, is as supernatural, and therefore as liable to be controverted as any of the doctrines or miracles which are

Digitized by Google

mentioned in the New Testament. The miraculous conception of the Saviour of the world by a virgin, is not more opposed to the ordinary course of natural events, nor is the doctrine of the atonement more above human reason, than those moral precepts which command us to love our enemies, or to die for our friends.

3. It has been said, that the *division of the Bible into chapters and verses* renders it more difficult to be read by children than many other books.

By a little care in the instructer this difficulty may be obviated, and even an advantage derived from it. It may serve to transfer the attention of the scholar to the *sense* of a subject: and no person will ever read well, who is guided by any thing else in his stops, emphasis, or accents. The division of the Bible into chapters and verses is not a greater obstacle to its being read with ease, than the bad punctuation of most other books. I deliver this stricture upon other books from the authority of Mr. Rice, the celebrated author of the art of speaking, whom I heard declare, in a large company in London, that he had never seen a book properly pointed in the English language. He exemplified, notwithstanding, by reading to the same company a passage from Milton, his perfect knowledge of the art of reading.

Some people, I know, have proposed to introduce extracts from the Bible into our schools, instead of the Bible itself. Many excellent works of this kind are in print; but if we admit any of them, we shall have the same inundation of them that we have had of grammars, spelling-books, and lessons for children, many of which are published for the benefit of the authors only, and all of them have tended greatly to increase the expense of education. Besides, these extracts or abridgments of the Bible often contain the tenets of particular sects or persons, and, therefore, may be improper for schools composed of the children of different sects of Christians. The Bible is a cheap book, and is to be had in every book-store. It is, moreover, esteemed and preferred by all sects; because, all acknowledge it contains their own peculiar doctrines. It should therefore be used in preference to any abridgments of it, or histories extracted from it.

I have heard it proposed that a portion of the Bible should be read every day by the master, as a means of instructing children in it; but this is a poor substitute for obliging children to read it as a school-book; for, by this means we insensibly *engrave*, as it were, its contents upon their minds; and it has been remarked that children instructed in this way in the Scriptures, seldom forget any part of them. They have the same advantage over those persons who have only heard the Scriptures read by a master, that a man who has worked with the tools of a mechanical employment for several years, has over the man who has only stood a few hours in a work-shop and seen the same business carried on by other people.

To the arguments I have mentioned in favor of the use of the Bible as a school-book, I shall add a few reflections:—

The present fashionable practice of rejecting the Bible from our schools, I suspect, has originated with the Deists. They discover great ingenuity in this new mode of attacking Christianity. If they proceed in it, they will do more in half a century in extirpating our religion, than Bollingbroke or Voltaire could have effected in a thou-

Digitized by Google

sand years. I am not writing to this class of people. My object is to change the opinions and conduct of those lukewarm or superstitious Christians, who have been misled by the Deists upon this subject.

The effects of the disuse of the Bible as a school-book, have appeared of late in the neglect and even contempt with which Scripture names are treated by many people. It is because parents have not been early taught to know or respect the characters and exploits of the Old and New Testament worthies, that their names are exchanged for those of the modern kings of Europe, or the principal characters in novels and romances. I conceive there may be some advantage in bearing Scripture names. It may lead the persons who bear them to study that part of the Scriptures in which their names are mentioned, with uncommon attention, and perhaps it may excite a desire in them to possess the talents or virtues of their ancient name-sakes. This remark first occurred to me upon hearing a pious woman, whose name was Mary, say, that the first passage of the Bible which made a serious impression upon her mind, were those interesting chapters and verses in which the name of Mary is mentioned in the New Testament.

It is a singular fact, that while the names of the kings and emperors of Rome are now given chiefly to *horses* and *dogs*, Scripture names have hitherto been confined only to the human species. Let the enemies and contemners of those names take care, lest the names of more modern kings be given hereafter only to the same animals, and lest the names of the modern heroines of romances be given to animals of an inferior species.

It is with great pleasure that I have observed the Bible so extensively used in the Sunday schools in England, and that the same practice is adopted in the Sunday schools lately established in the United States. This will give our religion (humanly speaking) the chance of a longer life in our country. We hear much of the persons educated in free schools in England, turning out well in the various walks of life. I have inquired into the cause of it, and have satisfied myself that it is in no small degree to be ascribed to the general use of the Bible in those schools; for, it seems, the children of poor people are of too little consequence to be guarded from the supposed evils of reading the Scriptures in early life, or in an unconsecrated school-house.

However great the benefits of reading the Scriptures in schools have been, I cannot help remarking that these benefits might be much greater, did school-teachers take more pains to explain them to their scholars. Did they demonstrate the divine original of the Bible, from the purity, consistency, and benevolence of its doctrines and precepts; did they inform their pupils that the gross and abominable vices of the Jews were recorded *only* as proofs of the depravity of human nature, and of the insufficiency of the law to produce moral virtues, and thereby to establish the necessity and perfection of the gospel system; and above all, did they often enforce the discourses of our Saviour as the best rule of life and the surest guide to happiness, how great would be the influence of our schools upon the order and prosperity of our country! Such a mode of instructing children in the Christian religion would convey knowledge into their *understandings*, and would therefore be preferable to teaching them to repeat selected passages, which too often convey, not knowledge, but *words* only, into their *memories*. I think I am not

Digitized by Google

too sanguine in believing, that education, conducted in this manner, would, in the course of two generations, eradicate infidelity from among us, and render civil government scarcely necessary in our country.

In contemplating the political institutions of the United States, I lament that we waste so much time and money in *punishing crimes*, and take so little pains to *prevent them*. We profess to be republicans, and yet we neglect the only means of establishing and perpetuating our republican forms of government; that is, the universal education of our youth in the principles of Christianity by means of the Bible; for this Divine Book, above all others, favors that equality among mankind, that respect for just laws, and all those sober and frugal virtues which constitute the soul of republicanism.

Perhaps an apology may be necessary, for my having presumed to write upon a subject so much above my ordinary studies. My excuse for it is, that I thought a single mite from a member of a profession which has been frequently charged with scepticism in religion, might attract the notice of persons who had often overlooked the more ample contributions, upon this subject, of gentlemen in other professions.

With great respect, I am, &c.

BENJAMIN RUSH.

POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. V.*

(ILLUSTRATED IN A SKETCH FROM PRIVATE LIFE.)

FRANCIS and Isabella Spencer were for ten full years regarded as the happiest wedded pair in the village of Greendale in Saxony. Blessed with affluence, an extensive circle of respectable and accomplished relatives and friends, and five lovely children, their years devoted to business and alternate pleasure, like a smooth and placid stream, gently and agreeably glided away. But they lived without God, without Christ, and without the hope of heaven.

It happened, one evening in May, that a stranger from a neighboring canton, overtaken in a thunder-storm, turned in for shelter, and through the hospitable importunities of Mr. and Mrs. Spencer, was constrained to abide with them all night. He was a Protestant preacher, of a truly primitive spirit, and sought every occasion to introduce his Master to their acquaintance: for he soon discovered that God was not in all their thoughts, nor acknowledged under their roof. His efforts, however, were unavailing. The parents seemed so much alive to the temporal

Digitized by Google

interests of their children, the affairs of the farm and the village, and the prospects of the season, they had no ear for Christ or the better country.

Morning came, and the preacher about to depart, said to Mrs Spencer, "My dear madam, I thank you for your kind and hospitable attentions to me during the evening, and am constrained in leaving you andthese beautiful and interesting children, for whose temporal destiny you seem so solicitous, to say, that it is with unfeigned sorrow I must bid you adieu without the hope of meeting you or them in the heavenly mansions. Might I, as a token of my respect for you, and interest in your welfare, ask you to accept this small volume, with a request that you will carefully read it yourself and communicate of its treasures to your children?"

With a respectful and complaisant smile, the good lady accepted the precious volume, saying, that 'although she had once read it at school, she would give it a second reading and see whether she could like it any better.' The gentleman went on his way; and after accompanying him to the gate, Mr. Spencer, with an unusual earnestness addressing his wife, said—"My dear Isabella, I have never before, on so slight an acquaintance, felt so much attached to a stranger. I hear a voice from within, saying, Surely this is a Christian. While showing him to bed last night he said, and oh! that I could give you an idea of the manner in which he said it! 'Do you, my friend,' he asked, 'never acknowledge God in your family in the presence of your wife and children—not even when you eat and drink, nor when you lie down or rise up? I observe you are a kind and tender parent, and you say you labor assiduously for the welfare of your children, that you make them honorable and happy: how, then, would you like to be treated by them as you treat your heavenly Father, who has done infinitely more for you than you ever can do for them?' I knew not what to reply, but muttered something about my ignorance of religious opinions. 'Opinions! opinions!' added the gentleman: 'is not ingratitude to an earthly benefactor reprobated as the worst of crimes? and how little do we owe, even to our most tender and indulgent parents, compared with our obligations to our heavenly parent and benefactor, who gives

Digitized by Google

us life, and breath, and being! And is ingratitude an opinion!!' Overwhelmed and confounded, I bade him good night and withdrew. But my sleep went from me; I felt ashamed of myself, and still feel self-condemned and know not what to do." "My dear husband," replied Mrs. Spencer, "I will tell you what we must do: We shall read this book, and see if we can learn any thing about our duty."

Some three months from this time, Mr. and Mrs. Spencer made a visit to Thurissa, a village on the bank of the Oder; and, while there, had the good fortune to meet with their former guest, the amiable and pious John Hussen, itinerant evangelist of the church in Thurissa. They went to hear him preach. So diligently and attentively had they read the New Testament and the Old, that when they heard the excellent and fervent preacher discoursing upon the significancy and value of the sacrificial death of the Messiah, they instantly, in the presence of the whole congregation, confessed their faith in his divine person and mission; and to the inexpressible joy of the raptured preacher, he had the felicity of baptizing them both into the death of Christ.

On his return to Greendale, Mr. Spencer made a great entertainment, and invited all his relations and friends, who, till the hour of their arrival, had heard nothing of what had happened at Thurissa. When they had all assembled, and before they entered the dining room, Mr. Spencer, with his amiable consort leaning on his arm, presented himself in the antechamber, and, after the usual salutations and inquiries, begging them all to be seated, he stood and said—"My dear friends, to my unutterable bliss, and that of your old acquaintance Mrs. Spencer, I must tell you that during our visit to the Oder, and since we last met with you around the festive board, we have both become Christians. It is not in the power of language, at least in our measure of the gift of speech, to express the heartfelt joy and peace, and the delightful hopes that now animate us. We really feel as though we had just been born into a new world. Truly, we now know that there is a "joy unutterable and full of glory." Still we feel that we are infants in knowledge, and but babes in Christ. But we cannot withhold from you the intelligence of the change of views and feelings of which we have been the happy subjects, nor omit the

Digitized by Google

earliest opportunity to give you our testimony against our former course of life, and in favor of that which we have now begun to lead.

"I need not tell you how much we have been enslaved to these mortal bodies—to the things of time and sense—nor how much we have sought for earthly enjoyments. Our many conversations with you on the ways and means of personal and family aggrandizement, and on all the frivolities of the manners, customs, and fashions of the age, are fresh in your recollections; and we have only to say, that we now joyfully to all these bid an eternal adieu. We have found purer pleasures and richer joys than these. To our shame it must be spoken, that, until within a few days, we never conversed with our children on their relations to God and the great unseen and eternal world. We have been seeking for them an earthly fortune and temporal honors, wholly neglectful of the things that are spiritual, heavenly, and eternal. But if the Lord will, we shall henceforth teach them by precept and example to "seek *first*, and above all, the kingdom of God and his righteousness," and afterwards the things that are needful for the body. I cannot tell you with what surprize the little creatures sat and looked, and listened to us, when, for the first time on last Lord's day morning we began to read to them and converse about the birth, life, death, and resurrection of the Lord, and to sing and pray in their presence. We had to explain to them, as frankly as we could, that we had during our absence been converted to the Lord, and would henceforth spend our time very differently from the days that are past, and that we now desired to have them accompany us to heaven; and would, therefore, constantly and daily endeavor to teach them the holy Scriptures and train them for the skies. They listened with raptures to our conversations, and already they come into the room, with as much interest as we could wish, to receive instructions and to hear us invoke the heavenly blessings and sing the praises of our Redeemer.

As we must henceforth cultivate a new character, having put on Christ, we have invited you to partake with us of a plain and unostentatious dinner, that we may have the double pleasure of seeing you in health and of imparting to you our views of the past, our present experience, and our intentions as respects the future.

Digitized by Google

On this, the company retired in silent astonishment to the dining-room, and while they stood around the table, Mr. Spencer, in the most solemn and reverential attitude, returned thanks to the Lord for the bounties of his providence and the blessings of his grace. The very table itself seemed to have been converted. Instead of what was formerly sought—a splendid display and a luxurious collation, a plain substantial dinner crowned the board, of which the astonished guests partook with a peculiar interest and pensiveness, as if musing on what had happened.

The evening passed most pleasantly away in further conversations—Mrs. Spencer with the ladies and her good husband with the gentlemen, on the excellencies of religion and the good things of the better country. All seemed for the moment pleased to share in the domestic bliss of the consecrated family; and as often as they met and conversed on the former taciturnity of Mr. and Mrs. Spencer when the subject of religion was introduced, were heard to say, 'Surely there is a sovereign power in religion when persons like these can be so effectually changed by it, and in so short a time.' A. C.

PROTESTANTISM.

I AM censured, reproved, and admonished by a very sagacious gentleman in the east of this commonwealth, whose "candid opinions" are not to be questioned, for having so far apostatized both from him and myself, as to undertake to defend Protestantism. With him *Protestantism* is clearly and infallibly one of the horns of the beast. Not having read the discussion, the gentleman, of course, volunteers his censures in anticipation of public opinion, in order to strengthen his opposition to me on other grounds more obnoxious than even Protestantism.

But that he, or any one laboring under the same distemper, may understand something of *Protestantism*, as it has been defended by me, I shall give a mere sample of the principles as expressed centuries ago:—

"In articles of faith the authority of the Holy Scriptures is the highest; and for that reason it is the standard of judging; so that whatsoever

Digitized by Google

doth not agree with the word of God, is deservedly to be rejected and avoided.

"The decrees of Fathers and Councils are [only] so far to be approved as they agree with the word of God.

"The reading and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures are open to, and necessary for all men, the laity as well as the clergy; and moreover, the writings of the Prophets and Apostles are to be read rather than the comments of men.

"Masses are impious; and it is madness to say Masses for the dead.

"Purgatory is the invention of men; for they who believe, go into eternal life; they who believe not, into eternal damnation.

"The invoking and worshipping of dead saints is idolatry.

"We must not obey the Pope and Bishops, because they are the wolves of the church of Christ.

"The Pope hath not the primacy over all the churches of Christ; neither hath he the power of both swords.

"That is the church of Christ which hears the pure doctrine of Christ, and observes the ordinances instituted by him, in whatsoever place it exists.

"Vows of celibacy are the inventions of men, and productive of uncleanness.

"So many orders [of the clergy,] so many marks of the beast.

"Monkery is a filthy carcass.

"So many superstitious dedications of churches, commemorations of the dead, benedictions of creatures, pilgrimages, so many forced fastings, so many superfluous festivals, those perpetual bollowings, [alluding to the practice of chanting,] and the observation of various other ceremonies, manifestly obstructing the teaching and learning of the word, are diabolical inventions.

"The marriage of Priests is both lawful and necessary.

"The Bible is the only infallible and all-sufficient rule of religious faith and practice."

Such is a sample of that "horn of the apocalyptic monster" called *Protestantism*, which I had the defection and the courage to maintain against the encroachments and pretensions of the Papacy in America! From the synopsis of discussion, as published in the May number, our readers may appreciate the candor and impartiality of such an imputation. I would only add, that in our latitude Protestantism is not identical with Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, nor Baptistism; but every thing in each and every one of these opposed to Romanism.

A. C.

Digitized by Google

"MATERIALISM CAMPBELLISM."

Such is the designation of an article in the Philomath Encyclopedia of January last, to which my attention was this day (June 13th) called for the first time by seeing posted between two hands, on the cover of the May number of said magazine, "☞A. Campbell again.☜" Mr. Kidwell, the Editor, some years ago was extremely anxious to engage me in a controversy with himself on the subject of Universalism. This I declined, because of the coarseness and abusiveness of his style, and the vulgarisms of his manner as a disputant with those who dissented from him.

It is said that he has reformed somewhat, and that he is recognized and sustained by many Universalists in the West, and that I have been unable to reply to him either on his Universalism or Materialism. All this may be true. There are many men who never can be confuted—very many that I am *unable* to answer. I am, indeed, very easily vanquished when my opponent substitutes scurrility and abuse for reason and sacred scripture, or when I see more conceit, superciliousness, and dogmatism, than good sense or sound logic. The gentleman himself, on the subject of Materialism, alleges that my "total silence" as respects his beautiful philosophic theory of an atmospheric soul, based on the *true physiology* of man, is "*probably* owing to a loss to find arguments to reply." Had I seen his piece before to-day, this might have been true: for, indeed, now that I have read it, I am at a loss for arguments to reply. I am not "physiologist enough" for these learned Doctors of atmospheric spirits that fill the cavities of the human lungs. The discoveries of modern science are far in advance of my prosing genius. They have discovered that man—the whole man, body, soul, and spirit—is but "organized and animated dust." It is alleged that the knife of the anatomist and the theory of the physiologist, irradiated by phrenology, have actually found out that man has "four spirits" instead of one; that the four gases, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon, are the four "invisible spirits" that make one "*living soul.*" This soul has been discovered to reside in the vesicles or small air tubes in the lungs: for, as Nature abhors a vacuum, the bronchial vessels must have been made for its residence; so that the human

Digitized by Google

soul enters by the nose, descends the windpipe, and resides in all the vesicles of the lungs. Tho thinking is indeed performed by the brain; for thought is but a "secretion of the brain," as bile is of the liver, or gastric juice of the stomach. These splendid discoveries were made some years since by the French physiologists; and Mr. Lawrence, so profound in physiology and anatomy, has incontrovertibly proved that the *marrow thinks*, or to express it more learnedly in his own words, "medullary matter thinks." The marrow in the leg, the marrow in the spine, and the marrow in the brain secrete different sorts of thoughts—spiritual, animal, sensual, &c.

It is alleged that this felicitous discovery effectually rids the world of ghosts, and the universe of both hades and gehenna; for in this theory there is no spirit, no ghost, nor separate state; no hell but the grave. This is an effectual way of disproving infant baptism; for infants dying are never raised to life again, nor are "the heathen who have had no written law." Hence a general resurrection and general judgment are metaphorical nonsense; and from these chimeras the world is happily relieved.

I do not know, however, that Mr. Kidwell goes quite so far; but other Materialists have in the present century gravely taught as corollaries from the new doctrine of atmospheric souls, that all infants and all Pagans dying naturally, die eternally, and shall never be raised to life again; so that a general "resurrection of the *just and unjust*," and a judgment of the world, or a general judgment, are parts and parcels of the metaphysics of Scotch theology.

The whole world, "Old World and New World," is challenged to disprove this theory—and the whole Bible is quoted to prove it. Now that I should fear and tremble, and feel myself unable to encounter such giants in physiology, anatomy, phrenology, and daimonology, will appear plain as a self-evident proposition, from the slightest attention to the proof these gentlemen have to offer.

Their first chapter consists of all those arguments drawn from our inability to see, hear, smell, taste, or feel an abstract spirit. And, of course, we are all stricken dumb.

The second chapter contains all the Bible, not newly transla-

Digitized by Google

ted, but newly interpreted: for example, it is said that when God made the body of man out of the dust, he gave him a soul, or made him "a living body" by causing the wind to blow in his face. "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life:" i. e. "the vital air," the atmosphere composed of two spirits, oxygen and azote or nitrogen, and then he became a living soul. So that he received his "living soul" from the vital air; or rather, his spirit is so much of the vital air as he can at any one inspiration inhale. Thus was man made in the image of God! But were not all the other breathing animals inspired as well as man? Did not God breathe into the nostrils of the goat and the swine a breath of life, and make them living souls too!!! Here, then, I am fairly conquered—unable to reply, and shall have to succumb to Mr. Kidwell, and beg of him in his tender mercies to spare my life, and call upon some mightier spirit, some stronger wind, from the Old World or the New, to reason with him or his brother Materialists.

I shall therefore crave his permission to continue the discussion of Universalism, as far as I can, with his brother Mr. Skinner, and leave him to luxuriate in his splendid theories of human souls, till he give up his oxygen and nitrogen ghost to the vital air which gave it him. Should Mr. Kidwell lay this piece before his readers, I will from that fact prove that he has one idea which his brain never did secrete: for might I not hope, even in his case, to prove *that looking at these printed words and being moved to reprint them on his pages, is an idea which owes its existence to my secretions.* So that his idea of republication will be a secretion of a secretion, an emanation from an emanation, possessing him by the eye rather than by the nose. But should he not be influenced to give these singular speculations upon his speculations to his readers, then his theory will stand triumphant; for it will then be clear as the sun that his soul is a pure compound of oxygen and nitrogen, with a very slight tincture or alloy of carbonic acid gas.—But they say love is blind, and that peculiar love which authors have for their own discoveries and inventions is the blindest of all the blind affections; and therefore there are those who would rather prove themselves to be all animal, than to be found mistaken in any of their crude speculations.

A. C.

Digitized by Google

MAN THE TEMPLE OF GOD.

Destroy this temple, and I will rebuild it in three days.
JESUS THE MESSIAH.

IT is of the essence of mind to admire its own creations. God looked upon all the works of his hand with delight; for he saw that they were good. It is of the essence of goodness to be communicative. Hence, God created beings to whom he communicated of himself; for he not only created a universe that could neither think nor speak, but he also created rational and communicative beings through whom to enjoy his celestial and terrestrial operations. Man was made for this world, to perceive and reflect its glories, that through him God might rejoice in these his lower works. For this purpose it behooved that man be endowed with something unearthly and superior—with powers of perceiving, loving, admiring, and adoring his Creator; or, in one word, with a power of both thinking and feeling in harmony with the whole universe. The earth was made for man, and man for God; so that God through man rejoices in all his earthly creations, and man through material nature rejoices in his Creator Such precisely, in our esteem, was the primitive man as he stood upon the primitive earth. God delighted in all his mundane operations through him, through his intellectual admiration and grateful emotions; and he delighted in God through all the sensible displays of creative power, wisdom, and goodness. This leads us to consider man in a most interesting attitude, and to assign him a very elevated place in creation. And to assist our conceptions of him, we shall consider his body in the light of a temple, as the Saviour has taught us in our motto.

God built the human body out of earthly materials. The temple rose at his bidding without the sound of axe or hammer. Bone came to its bone and every joint to its place without noise or confusion. He embraced them with sinews, secured them by ligatures, and bound them to their places. He then covered them with muscles, arteries and veins, with flesh and skin, and furnished the inner chambers with all the apparatus of life—the machinery of physical, intellectual, and moral action. It stood before him finished, though a tenantless, silent, breathless statue, as stood

Digitized by Google

the tabernacle when finished by Moses, before the glory of the Lord filled the holy place. The air surrounded it, but it breathed not. It had eyes, but it saw not; ears, but it heard not, till God breathed into its nostrils the *breath of life.* Then its brain, and heart, and lungs, and arteries began to move—the current of life began to flow, and man was made a living soul.

The *breath of the Lord* will be better understood when we look for a moment at two other temples which were built after the archetype of man, and as types of man restored to the place from which he had fallen. For however the tabernacle or temple may be regarded, as adumbrative, they had their model in man.

The model of both was divine. God himself was the model of man; for he created him after his own image. He also gave Moses the image of the tabernacle while in his company on the mount. Moses faithfully copied the original: for the tent which he reared was exactly according to the model shown him in Horeb. But like Adam's body before God, it stood before Moses tenantless and unglorified. This, however, was but for a moment for, as in the case of Adam, God breathed into his nostrils; so in this, he descended in a cloud and filled the tent with his glory. The air indeed was not a spirit of God, nor was the cloud his glory; but while the cloud rested on the tabernacle the glory of the Lord filled it; and while the breath of God fanned the lungs of Adam, the Spirit of the Lord gave him understanding. The glory of the Lord to human optics was not separable from the cloud in the one case, nor was the inspiration of mind distinguishable from the breath of life in the other case; but it was no more the mere breath of animal life in the one case, than it was a mere cloud of vapor in the other: for the spirit of man is not mere breath, nor is the glory of the Lord a mere cloud.

Solomon's stone temple being erected after the model given to David and himself, so far as it perfected the tabernacle or tent temple, still farther illustrates this grand idea. Soon as Solomon had finished and set in order this most splendid of all earthly edifices, as the body of Adam was the most splendid of all the animal frames reared out of the dust, we are told that "the house was so filled with vapor, or breath, that the priests could not stand to minister for the cloud: for the glory of the Lord had filled the

Digitized by Google

house of God." And still more striking as a proof that the Divinity was present, "fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices, and the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord."*

Thus God took up his residence in Adam, in the tabernacle, and in the temple on the day of their erection: for these are three temples equally modelled, reared, and glorified by God. The analogy is even yet more perfect than we have traced it: for in each of these three there was an external as well as an internal glory. The cloud and the fire—the bright vapor sat upon the tabernacle and the temple in their primitive state, and showed that the Lord was within. So Adam and Eve were covered with an external glory, as well as filled with a holy spirit, in their primitive condition; but soon as they transgressed the external glory departed—they saw that they were naked—they became ashamed and hid themselves from the presence of the Lord.

The *breath of life*, or the *spirit of life*, as it may be rendered with equal authority, includes more than vapor or vital air. It denotes more than mere animal life: for this would have been no glory to man, inasmuch as all this is common to the beasts that perish. But we have a still more striking circumstance illustrative of this singular incident in man's creation. When the Lord Jesus was about to erect another sort of temple than a tent or a stone house on earth, he chose to symbolize the impartation of the Holy Spirit of God by a recurrence to God's breathing into the nostrils of Adam. Hence, when sending forth his Apostles and making them the nucleus of a new body, "he *breathed on them*, saying, *Receive the Holy Spirit.*" Did they not at this moment receive more than his breath! or did not this breathing denote that they did receive a life from him above other men, or the beasts that perish! So understand we the model of this idea—God's breathing into the nostrils of Adam.

But we have yet another temple: "Destroy this temple," said Jesus, "and I will rebuild it in three days." This he said of his *body*. Adam in this also "was the *type* of him that was to come." His body was God's first earthly temple, and his Spirit the Priest that officiated there The body of Jesus God himself reared out

* 2 Chron. vi. 13, 14—vi. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

of the flesh of the woman Mary. "That holy *thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God:" for God gave him more than breath, and more than a human spirit. He gave his own Spirit without measure to him. He gave Adam a small measure and to all his descendants mere sparks of intelligence; but this person is "THE WORD *made flesh*," "EMANUEL," "GOD IN MAN," "*God manifest in the flesh.*" He breathed on him as a child no measured gifts of his Spirit, but the Spirit himself in all his fulness. The Holy Spirit, not like a cloud, nor breath, but in the *personal* form of a *dove*, descended upon him and remained with him. This was indeed after he was born of water, after he was erected or raised out of Jordan. The glory of the Lord after this sanctification filled the temple: "We beheld his glory, the glory of an Only Begotten of the Father, *full of grace and truth.*" With Solomon we ask, "Will God, in very deed, dwell with man upon the earth! Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less the body of Adam, the tabernacle of Moses, the temple of Solomon, the body of Jesus! Still, God, in some peculiar sense, inhabited them all. And yet he dwells with man: for ———

There is yet a fifth temple. There is still a tabernacle for God on earth, a temporary building moving to and fro—a "spiritual house," a holy temple—*the Christian church.* "The temple of God is holy," says Paul, "which temple you are." The Lord reared out of the body of Adam the body of a woman; out of the body of a woman he also reared the body of his Son; and out of the human body of his Son raised from the dead he has raised a church of men and women, whom he fills with the glory of the Lord, his Holy Spirit. "Know you not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which dwells in you, which you have of God." All Christians are living stones in this spiritual house. They are in their individual capacity severally temples of the Holy Spirit, and collectively they are now the only earthly temple of God. "I will dwell in them—I will walk in them—I will be their God—they shall be my people," are promises of the Christian Institution. Hence, the Holy Spirit is promised to all who are baptized into the body of Christ: for all Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, are baptized into one body, and par-

Digitized by Google

take of one and the same Holy Spirit—as from their own experience they can amply testify.

The fifth temple when reared on Pentecost, was the consummation of the earthly state; and therefore it was gloriously distinguished. The Spirit was heard in the wind, was seen on the heads of the Apostles; but the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. He breathed into their nostrils the spirit of life; but there was more than atmospheric air, more than the sound of a mighty rushing wind, more than tongues resembling cloven flame—there was the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and the consecration of the church as the temple of the living God. While a cloud of glory covered this new building of God, the glory of the Lord filled the temple, and they communicated as the Spirit gave them utterance. The Spirit which that day descended from heaven has not yet ascended. He is still in the church his body, and witnesses to our spirits, not to our *breath*, that we are the sons of God. The Christian body grows as the human family grows—children are born of her and to her out of the world. Soon as they are born the Lord breathes into their nostrils the breath of lives: for the second Adam is more than a living soul—he is a life-giving Spirit.

It ends, then, as it began. Man is still the temple of God. God at first imparted to him a spirit from himself, that he might commune with him—that he might be "*a son of God*" as well as his creature, and that he might be "*the Father of his spirit*" as well as the Creator of his body. When he sinned and departed from God, he dwelt with man only in a tabernacle and in a temple till Jesus came; and now that Jesus is gone, to be himself the temple of the New Jerusalem, the church, filled with the Spirit, is the only earthly temple of God, "a habitation of God through the Spirit;" and here it is that God meets with us and communicates his spiritual blessings.

What poor conceptions have they of the image of God, and of man created in his likest image, who fancy it all to consist in mere animal organization! What grovelling notions of man's original inspiration, who level it to the vital air and animal respiration! With them inspiration is respiration!! We will rather say with Elihu, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of

Digitized by Google

the Almighty giveth him understanding." "God our Maker teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven"!

What a sublime contrivance is the economy of nature and grace! In nature and in grace the human heart answers to the golden altar that stood before the vail. The human spirit sanctified by God, is the officiating priest. This golden altar irradiated by the golden lamps, symbolize the human understanding enlightened by nature and grace. From this altar, now sprinkled by the blood of Jesus, ascend to heaven the praises of universal nature and the thanksgivings of a ransomed and redeemed people.

In nature there is no beauty seen by God but as it is reflected from the human heart; no melody heard but as it echoes from the human soul. Philosophers know that all the lines of beauty, that all the lights and shades, that all the attitudes and forms and colors of earthly charms are arranged and fitted for the human eye on, or near, the surface of this planet; and from any other point there is no visible beauty in all material nature. Enlightened by the word and works of God, one may say, the glories of the azure vault, with all its shining orbs of light, are thrown upon the human heart by the eye, as upon a polished mirror, that they may be thence reflected to the sempiternal Mind that placed them where they are, and that delights in them only as they radiate from beings intellectually and morally capable of discerning and enjoying them. The sublimity, grandeur, and magnificence of ocean, lake, river, and mountain scenery; the beauties of all the varied landscapes on the globe, with all the riches of all the realms of nature—animal, vegetable, mineral, are sources of delight to their benevolent Author only as they awaken in the human heart sentiments of piety, love, and gratitude to himself, as the source of all excellence and glory. The majestic rolling thunder, the deafening tempest, and that burst of universal joy; those ceaseless melodies and harmonies of all things vocal on earth, in air, or sea, ascend not to the ears of the Creator, only as they echo from souls attuned to hymn his praise in strains of grateful admiration. If man be blind, all nature is blank; if man be dumb, all nature is silent before its Maker. If he looks and speaks as a saint, all nature rejoices—all the birds of the air, all the beasts of

Digitized by Google

the field, all the fish of the sea, trees and shrubs and flowers, hills and vallies, mountains, seas and rivers, echo the praises of the Lord.

From these general reflections on the human body as a temple, the human heart as an altar, the spirit of man as a priest, the domains of nature and of grace as abounding with an infinite variety of offerings, we may learn man's dignity in this creation, his duty and his bliss; as well as perceive what a large space he occupies in the regard and affection of his Creator, Father, and Redeemer. We may also perceive how many acceptable sacrifices and thank-offerings, and what precious incense we may continually present before the Lord. Not a bird that sings, whose melody—not a flower that blooms, whose fragrance, we may not send to heaven sanctified by the grateful admiration of an enlightened understanding and a devoted heart. A. C.

LETTERS TO ENGLAND—*No.*

Mr. J. Wallis:

Dear brother—As reformation is the order of the day, both England and America, permit me to offer a few remarks on the whole subject. So far as we have undertaken the work, it consists of three chapters. These are, The reformation of sinners—the reformation of Christians—and the reformation of religious institutions. We need not spend a moment in showing that on proper occasions any one of these may be a laudable object of Christian effort and enterprize. They are, however, not only to be regarded, but to be proposed and prosecuted as separate and distinct undertakings. Accept, then, of a few remarks on each of them.

The reformation of sinners, or the preaching of "repentance towards God and of faith in Jesus Christ" to persons unreconciled to God, is a work in which so many are engaged, and which is so commonly practised, that it would seem almost superfluous to write either formally or at much length upon the subject. Still, as there are various and very diverse methods in use, a very few practical remarks may not be wholly out of season.

Digitized by Google

In the first place, then, the conversion of sinners, so far as human instrumentality is concerned, (and who ever saw a person converted to Jesus Christ without human instrumentality?) ought to be prosecuted as a work separate and distinct from every other. One business at a time is enough for the powers of any one man; still more, a business of such transcendent importance. The preacher is to be wholly engrossed in this single work, and to have nothing in his eye but Christ and the sinner.

In the next place, the peculiar and distinct nature of the work in which he is engaged must be regarded. Proving tenets, exploding false theories or establishing the true, offering criticisms, discussing questions, resolving cases of conscience, or propounding principles of any sort, are no part of the work of converting sinners, or of preaching reformation to ungodly men. Preaching the gospel is "laying the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith in God," and is never to be accomplished by theorizing, speculating, or debating on any one point in theology or human science. We address sinners in such cases on their own affairs. We speak not *of* them, nor merely *before* them; but *to* them. We reason, remonstrate, exhort, beseech. We aim at one point in all that we say; and that one point is their reconciliation to God.

And this will oblige us, in the third place, to select the proper topics: for the sinner is to be spoken to in reference to sin, righteousness, and judgment. The Saviour, in his person, offices, and mission, is to be laid before him; and he is to be persuaded to repose a scriptural confidence in him, and to submit himself to him in all his requisitions. Sin and condemnation, righteousness and salvation, the sinner and the Messiah, are to be fully opened to his understanding; and all the motives which the Bible furnishes to induce to instant, cordial, and unreserved submission, are to be urged upon him till he believes, repents, and is baptized; or until he entirely turns away his ears from the word of righteousness and life. Such is the appropriate work of the preacher.

To convert men to a party, to a tenet, and to a person, are very different projects. In proselyting to a party, or a tenet, we offer the claims of the party, or the tenet, as the case may be.

Digitized by Google

But in converting men to a person, we keep before their mind simply the claims which that person has upon them. It is in this our day, peculiarly necessary to make these matters exceedingly plain: for we have much reason to think that many confound conversion to a doctrine, to a theory, or to a party, with conversion to Christ. They seem to think that in subscribing a creed or in joining a party, they are uniting with Christ and giving themselves up to the Lord.

The Christian religion is indeed a *personal* concern. It is confidence in a person, love to a person, delight in a person. It is not confidence in a doctrine, nor love to a party. Jesus Christ is the object on which a Christian's faith, hope, and love terminate; and to be with Christ is the Christian's heaven. Therefore, conversion is a turning to the Lord—in order to which Christ must be preached, and nothing else.

But then it is possible for Christians—for converted persons, to lose their first love, and to neglect their former works. It is possible for them to become forgetful that they were purified from their former sins, and to backslide. Hence the necessity of the reformation of Christians. The reformation of Christians is, however, to be distinguished from their growth. It is to be expected that Christians, being first babes and children before full grown men in Christ, will long continue to grow and advance in Christian knowledge, faith, hope, love, and in self-government; or in practical sobriety, righteousness, and godliness. The means of this growth in grace is a scriptural growth in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord. But, instead of adding to faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and universal benevolence, Christians sometimes subtract the Christian virtues one by one from their character, and actually backslide, fall into sin, and become barren and unfruitful in their profession. These are the proper subjects of Christian reformation. To such persons Paul's addresses, 1 Cor. 10th and 11th chapters, Hebs. 3d and 4th chapters, but especially most of the Saviour's seven letters to the Asiatic churches, and various other hints and passages in the apostolic epistles directly apply.

In the reformation of such professors, we must first seek to

Digitized by Google

effect what Paul calls a godly sorrow for the past. "For godly sorrow worketh reformation to salvation not to be repented of." We must call upon them and entreat them, as did the Saviour the Ephesian church, to "remember whence they are fallen and reform, and do their first works," on peril of having their light turned into darkness and their day into night; or as he addressed those of Sardis, entreating them to "remember how they had received and heard, and to hold fast, and repent," else perchance he might come upon them as a thief in an unexpected hour.

When Christians become lukewarm in their profession, they must be urged to reformation with that importunacy with which sinners are besought to repent and turn to God: for there is danger always of an apostacy to utter ruin if Christians suffer themselves to become indifferent, or even lukewarm in their allegiance to the Lord. It is in relation to such persons that James says: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and any one convert him, [or bring him back,] let him know that he who converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." Hence the strong inducements to urge delinquent Christians to return to their duties. This delinquency always commences at the closet door, but usually becomes manifest by forsaking, or at least by becoming negligent in attending upon the assemblies of the faithful, or the ordinances of the Christian congregation. While other more open errorists are to be admonished, these are to be *warned* of imminent danger.

But the reformation of Christians is usually, in the present time, taken in another sense. It has respect to a state of general delinquency or apostacy—not that which is final and irremediable, but that which consists in degeneracy from the standard of Christian excellence. The reformation of Christians in reference to such a general defection, is that which now presses upon our attention and commands our efforts.

The Jews became generally corrupt in sundry periods of Old Testament history; still they were Jews and held fast the Jewish institution, though greatly corrupted. Christians in like manner have, in sundry periods of their history, became generally corrupt; still they professed the Christian religion, and did not wholly renounce its claims upon their homage and respect.

Digitized by Google

But a corrupt people never yet held fast a pure religion. When they happened to be in possession of a true and pure religion, objectively considered, they have corrupted its institutions exactly in the ratio of their own delinquency. Hence, with me at least, it has become a law of conscience or of mind, or, if any one prefers it, a law of human nature, to which there is no exception, *that the practical piety and morality of any community will never be sounder than their religious and moral institutions;* or, the corruptions of religion will always be in proportion to the degeneracy of the people. Hence it follows that *we may expect to find the purest and the most uncorrupt institutions of religion amongst the most pure and virtuous people.* And may I not challenge the faithful pages of ecclesiastic history to adduce a single exception! Nay, is it not most manifest that the more corrupt any community, the more corrupt its institutions of religion; and the more moral and religious the people, the purer and more uncorrupt their religious institutions.

It is owing to this singularly remarkable and instructive fact, that reformations of religionists and reformations of religion have so generally been identified, or at least confounded. The reformation of an institution must, indeed, in the nature of things, or in the order of cause and effect, be prior to the reformation of the people; yet, perhaps, it generally happens that they accompany one another as it respects time. So it was at the time of the Protestant Reformation and at every subordinate reformation since that glorious era.

While, then, we endeavor to mark out the difference between a reformation of an institution, and that of the people under it, still we would not be regarded as attempting the one without a due regard to the other. We admit that the reformation of the institution does not so necessarily involve that of the people, as the reformation of the people does that of the institution. We may have the cause without the effect, while we cannot have the effect without the cause.

But the Christian institution being perfect, cannot be reformed only so far as it has been corrupted by the introduction of human inventions. To reform it is impossible, only by restoring it to the church in its original form and meaning; or, what is the

Digitized by Google

same thing, otherwise expressed, by purifying it from the alloy of all human opinions and traditions, and by reinstating the Bible as it stood when John the Apostle wrote the last *Amen*. And by reforming Christians neither more nor less ought to be proposed than their exact conformity in spirit, word, and action, to the pure and holy doctrine of eternal righteousness and eternal life, as clearly and fully propounded to us in those writings "which are able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work."

This is a reformation of a lofty daring, but hard to be effected. It is hard to be effected, because it is wholly impracticable for a corrupt people. It requires as much perfection in the people as in the system to which they aspire. To ascend is much more difficult than to descend. Even to desire a restoration of primitive Christianity in letter and spirit, in faith and practice, is not possible, except to a highly cultivated and spiritually-minded population; and as these are not yet the majority of the best sect in Christendom, we cannot promise ourselves the pleasure of seeing it pervade the whole land in a few years. Nations have become Protestants in a day, so far as saving Peter's pence and servile obedience to a foreign despot is concerned; but what nation ever became Protestant in a day, so far as doing all things whatsoever the Lord Jesus has commanded!

To reform a reformation is harder still than to reform an unreformed institution. But, as respects the past reformations of England and America, and that in contemplation and in progress now, we have much to say—which cannot be said in this letter. We shall therefore bid you God speed in the good cause, for another moon, when we shall have stated that we advocate not a reformation upon a dozen of other reformations; but a full *restoration* of the original gospel institutions as delineated on the sacred pages, and as practised by the first Christians. More than this we cannot ask, and less than this we dare not attempt, if we expect the Lord to help and bless us in the glorious undertaking.

Ever yours,

In the hope of a triumphant Christianity,

A. CAMPBELL.

Digitized by Google

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISCUSSION.

I AM told that Bishop Purcell, and his brother the editor of "the Catholic Telegraph," are still telling the people what a glorious triumph he gained in the late discussion. I proposed to exchange with the aforesaid "Telegraph" from January last, and accordingly have since that date regularly sent the *Millennial Harbinger*. I received at one time a complete file of the "Telegraph," from December 15th to April 20th inclusive; since which time I have received but one paper—that of June 8th. From this I perceive that Bishop Purcell is yet gloriously engaged in claiming a triumph. Thus far report is true. He seems to labor with but little success: for although he began to claim victory in his first speech, and has been constantly engaged in repeating it ever since, he appears not yet fully satisfied that either himself or any one else believes him. And, from his own showing, I am fully persuaded, with all his vanity, self-esteem, and veneration in full operation, he can never persuade himself that he sustained a single assumption or attribute of the papacy.

There are five or six persons—the Bishop himself, his brother the editor of the "Telegraph," Mr. Hammond, Priest Montgomery, Doctor Underhill of the "Liberalist," and some other editor in Cincinnati—who have said that the Bishop gained a splendid or some other sort of a triumph.

Of these, however, the Bishop, his brother, and Mr. Hammond, were determined from the beginning he should have a victory. The Cincinnati editor that testified that he never heard a speech, but that the Protestants themselves had told him Dr. Purcell had "conquered," when asked for his Protestant authority, gave, as I learned, some two or three Atheists or Owenites as the authors of his faith. But Dr. Underhill actually read almost half the book, and then published in his "Liberalist" that the Bishop not only disproved Protestantism, but sustained all the pretensions of Popery as far back as the earliest antiquity. But, unfortunately for this infidel deponent, he alleges that the Book of Mormon is built on better authority and is more credible than the Old or New Testament, and that he has more faith in Joseph Smith than the Son of Mary. I have no doubt but that all the Roman Catholics will believe the Bishop and his Catholic Telegraph, and that all the *credulous* infidels will believe the two *Protestant* Atheists, and Dr. Underhill the Cleaveland *liberalist*; and consequently these two masses of society will form an alliance against the other third———and woes me! They have got two to one!! What a glorious defeat I have won!!

But from the Catholic Telegraph of June 8th it appears that the Bishop himself has been writing for some time on the subject of Saint Ligori, and I know not what else, endeavoring, as the paper of June 8th shows, to throw dust into the eyes of his implicit believers. If the other *pieces* he has written be of *a-piece* with this before me, I think he will need a more efficacious and authoritative absolution than his Priests can give him. Such a monstrous tissue of misrepresentation I have not seen for many a day! As no person but a Roman Catholic or an Owenite will believe it, and as the Bishop will not let his readers see any thing I write on the subject, it is wholly unworthy of a grave refutation. Still, however, as a sort of recommendation of his episcopal dignity, I must notice for the benefit of all those to whom these presents may come, the main point of this said essay. The article has for its object a defence of the Bishop from the seven suppressed pages given to our readers in the May number.

But, asks the Bishop, "Why did the printed report of Mr. Campbell's speeches fall short of mine by seven pages? I answer, first, *Because he*

Digitized by Google

omitted much that he was ashamed should appear before the public eye." His specifications of this "much that he was ashamed," &c. are that I left out all "his incomprehensible blundering about Gregory and Phocas;" that I "changed the stenographer's notes about that point, and modified all he had said," &c. and "put the publishers to the expense and trouble of breaking one of the stereotyped plates and casting another." The *trouble* of *breaking* was very great compared with the *expense* of *casting*, &c. He has appealed to one of the Reporters and Mr. James. I have no objection to his witnesses; for I may want them myself on various occasions. But let the gentleman be very careful how he employs them: for I need not tell them to be careful how they testify. But to the case before us: Now of all this so much is true, that in the printed debate, on page 30th, line first at the top, there are just *three words*, bare *three words* altered from the proof as furnished the Bishop by Mr. James. For "*He was* consecrated," it now reads "*Gregory* consecrated him." Now this change in the copy transcribed from Mr. Cranch's notes, was wholly unintentional, and besides it gained for me nothing in the world; because all that is now told in the printed report, is told without the alteration or with it, as any one may see who will read it. And as to breaking a plate and making a new one, &c. any one knows that stereotypers for the alteration of *three words* or a whole line, are not obliged to cast a new plate—nor was it done on this occasion to my knowledge or belief.

Concerning his other specification about my not copying into the debate all that was read from Horne's Introduction,—I observe, that all that I intended to use, or did use in argument, is published. A small paragraph, irrelevant to the point, happened through mistake to be read; and on his insisting that that also should be inserted, I wrote a note to Mr. James requiring of the Bishop a similar correction of some omission that was in one of his speeches. The Bishop, rather than make the alteration required, chose to permit my extracts from Horne to be printed as they are, and as I used them in the debate. So that if there be any error here, the blame lies not at my door, as my note to Mr. James on the occasion will show, if the Bishop (who says he has it) will produce it to persons by us selected to examine it.

But now that the reader has a fair specimen of the Bishop's exceptions to the debate in justification of wronging me and the public of *seven pages* of matter positively stipulated for, and according to all the circumstances of the case an integral part of said discussion, I proceed to lay before my readers some documents, which I hoped, for the honor of my opponent, never to have been called upon to expose to the public eye. For my own credit's sake in falling into such company, I endeavored to sustain the dignity of my opponent, even when he rendered the burthen almost insupportable: for really it was often like an effort to make lead to swim, to keep him up to the dignity of discussion. This will be long remembered by all who were present during the debate.

Nothing shocked me so much during the discussion, as the efforts since made to foist into the debate matters that were never spoken or alluded to on the stage. A remarkable instance of this sort occurred on the 222d page of the printed discussion. A story was invented by the Bishop on the subject of remission of sins as an excuse for the Popish doctrine, and in abuse of myself touching the ordinance of baptism. It filled about half a page, the proof-sheet of which I have now lying before me. It being as perfect a fraud as the Book of Mormon, I sat down and wrote to the Bishop in the words following, to wit:—

Digitized by Google

BISHOP PURCELL,

Dear Sir—I have to request the entire erasure of the interpolation of nearly half the page 222, from the words, "If he persist," line 5th, to the words, "I ask, why does he," line 26th. Whatever power of *absolution* I may possess in reference to *venal* sins of omission and commission on various other pages, I have no power to grant an *indulgence* for such a *mortal* sin as the introduction of a new story which never happened on earth, and which you never told upon the stage.

You will please reserve that for the Appendix; and also reserve for a place along with it, all of page 224, from "English Divines" to the close of the speech. I cannot assent to these interpolations, especially as my speeches are all written—unless you allow me a new speech to reply to them.——Respectfully,

A. CAMPBELL.

To which he replied as follows:—

CINCINNATI, 25th Feb., 1837.

My dear Friend—If we become so *minutious*, we shall never have done. You introduce Judas as a martyr to Christianity, and the tender feet of Balaam's ass, &c. &c. &c. which were not in the oral debate. I do not object. *I certainly read that* extract of the *English Divines* from the *Churchman*. It is a suite to the foregoing, and the best of it, in that paper. If you ask a space equivalent to that occupied by the matter to which you object, you may have it, and I will be content with less in the Appendix. Be accommodating, or I must insist on your leaving out many smart and stinging sayings which you have introduced.

Believe me to be, maugre wrangling, respectfully yours,

†JOHN B. PURCELL.

On which I remark—

1st. That the gentleman admits the interpolation, and seeks to justify it by alleging that I also interpolated.

2d. The case which he adduces as proof of interpolation is not fact: for I did positively on the stage introduce *Judas as a martyr;* but the Bishop was not always in a *condition* to notice all that I did allege.

3d. As to the extracts from the Churchman which he read, I was not confident of the extent of them, and therefore I did not insist upon their entire suppression.

4th. He promises me space equivalent in the Appendix, if I would allow him to introduce this fiction; which is proof positive of a stipulation for an Appendix.

5th. The effort he makes to find exceptions in my printed speeches, by his "Balaam's ass," his three &c's, and my "stinging sayings," to furnish a plea for a license to interpolate—shows how faithful the report of my speeches is for 222 pages at least, maugre all his late attempts to excuse himself for his Jesuitical trick about the seven pages.

6th. He did reserve the 224th page for the Appendix, as I jeeringly told him—taking care, however, to keep the whole Appendix to himself.

Farther comment on this shameful transaction would be as unnecessary as to kill the dead. But I will again answer the question why I fell behind the Bishop seven pages. But first I fell behind more than *ten pages:* for Mr. James proffered to put ten pages of the average of the book in *seven* pages small letter. And yet it is admitted that I spoke more words in an hour than my opponent. The facts are these:—

1. In my morning and afternoon speeches, I very frequently, for the sake of new attendants, recapitulated some parts of the argument or proof, that the point and connexion might be seen. These, which together would amount to several pages, were expunged as unnecessary in the printed discussion.

2. But in the next place the Bishop read much more than I did; and of course that which is read cannot be at all condensed by a reporter or translator.

3. But in the third place, there is more printed in his speeches than was actually read on the stage, as before stated.

These are certainly a very obvious solution of his *ad captandum* question.

Digitized by Google

That these pages and the Appendix which himself finally proposed, (for as to the *notes*, Mr. James preferred having an Appendix to notes at the bottom of the page,) have been suppressed from *conscious defeat*, I argue not only from the whole course pursued by the Bishop during the debate, and especially from all the manœuvring and effort at interpolation and suppression in the publication; but also from a new fact which I learned the other day. And that is, that in the copies forwarded to Baltimore (and I know not to how many other points) by the Bishop and his Clergy, *even the single page garbled out of the seven, which is found in the copies circulated by Mr. Burnet, is not bound in the book, or has been cut out of the Roman Catholic copies*, so that these poor deluded votaries of the Clergy might have an expurged edition no way detrimental to the infallibility of the Bishop!

It gives me no pleasure to go into the exposition of human depravity; and had the Bishop and his tools the Priests suffered the book to have been published and circulated as stipulated, I should not have begun (for I have only yet begun) to elevate the *vizard*, not the *mitre*, that adorns the phiz of this paragon of a virgin priesthood.

In the number before me he seems to apologise for the lameness of his arguments on Transubstantiation, and refers to their written works. If the gentleman were to command the "Telegraph" to allow me a few pages monthly to speak to his people on that or any other subject included in my propositions, instead of filling them with misrepresentations, it might, perhaps, afford him a better opportunity to edify his readers, than to be telling them weekly what a glorious victory he won. They would then *see* rather than *believe*. A. C.

News from the Churches.

NEAR COLUMBIA, Boon county, Mo. April 22, 1837.

I CAME to this country last Fall, and have settled not far from Columbia, and have united with the church of Christ in that place. We have had a few additions to the congregation since I came, and on last Lord's day one other confessed the Lord. We expect this season to erect a brick meeting-house for our accommodation. Brother M. P. Wills is still, and has long been, their faithful and able teacher. He and myself have made one *preaching* trip to Fayette, in Howard county. Our meeting there was exceedingly pleasant and interesting. Four confessed the Lord Jesus during our sojourn there. We met at that place Elder F. R. Palmer, of Kentucky, and that worthy veteran in the *Bible cause*, Elder Thomas M'Bride. Brother Palmer has now gone to Independence, in Jackson county, where I trust he will be a great benefit to that people, as you are well apprised of his distinguished abilities as a Christian teacher.

I have also labored considerably in the congregation of Millersburg, Callaway county: several have recently been added to that church by *faith* and *obedience*. Elders Jacob and Joseph Coons, and —— Daviess, labor to good effect with the brethren there.

Brother Ridgeway (a late Baptist preacher) has lately, with some ten or fifteen others, left the *Baptist* church at Gilead in this county,

Digitized by Google

and organized themselves into a *church of Christ.* Brother Wills and myself were with them on the 2d Lord's day in this month: one was then added to their number.

The people are more concerned about the affairs of this world and life, in this country, than I could wish; but still I think I can say candidly, and without vanity or egotism, that, from all I have seen or heard, we are at least equal in *any* respect to our neighbors.

There are five or six churches in this county, planted upon the Bible, contending for the reformation, demanded by the word of the Lord, under existing circumstances. There is also an equal number in Howard; and some four or five, I believe, in Callaway—two of them I know to be large and flourishing.

Next week, if the Lord will, brother Wills and myself expect to go to Paris, in Monroe county, to attend a meeting of several days continuance there. You may expect to hear from me occasionally, when I will make such communications as I may think will interest you and your readers.

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

We thank our much esteemed brother Allen for what he has done and proposes to do. There is much neglect or indifference, or something in the way of our brethren in contributing to the edification and comfort of the brethren in respect of their labors and of the progress of their pleadings and of the truth in their respective vicinities. We ought to remember that whatever is gratifying to ourselves is also gratifying to others, interested in the spread of the truth; and then we should not withhold from others whatever can be either profitable or pleasing to them.——A. C.]

DUNSVILLE, Va., June 3, 1837.

Since I last wrote you we have been visited in these parts by brother R. L. Coleman, whose labors were very acceptable to the disciples and the community in general. I returned with him to the hill country of Monticello, Charlottesville, and the University. There was much to gratify me in the rural walks of Jefferson, who labored on the mountain for a name—and gained it. Its import was, however, *political*

The cause in Eastern Virginia is steadily advancing. Its growth is healthy and lasting. Union, love, and good order generally exist among the churches. In York county the disciples are healthy in the truth. I preached among them four days at Whitsuntide, and four persons were added by immersion. I also visited the brethren in Matthews, who labor under considerable difficulty for want of a house to meet in. They are about to erect one for themselves. Last Saturday and Lord's day I preached at Mangohick, in King William county, and immersed four into the name. Four persons were immersed into this body as brother Coleman and I went to Charlottesville. This church is near one hundred strong. *They keep the ordinances.* This, indeed, is the secret of a church's power. Proscription is narrowing its boundaries daily. A few unhallowed and illiberal spirits will by and by find themselves alone in their attempts to tie down and manacle the spirit of inquiry for which this age is distinguished; and were they dead and buried, science would not wear crape for the loss of a single son.

Upon being applied to, a Baptist preacher, of high standing here, gave his hearty assent to my preaching in one of their houses, and recommended his church to give their assent; but four of the members were opposed to it; and it being a rule of the church that members must be received, and preachers invited by "a unanimous vote," I was of course shut out. I am pleased with the liberality of the Pastor. I

Digitized by Google

expect to preach in one of Mother Nature's houses in that neighborhood (under an oak tree) before long, and I hope those who objected to my having the house will attend, and see if we speak according to the Oracles or not. JAMES HENSHALL.

[We are much gratified to hear from various sources, Christian affairs are assuming a much better appearance in Eastern Virginia. If we are pleased with liberality on the part of our Baptist brethren, let us not be behind them in any of those things on account of which we commend them. Let us always aim at being foremost in every thing which we commend in others, and hindmost in every thing which we reprobate. Whenever a Baptist or Pedobaptist of good character is in need of a meeting-house in which we have any property, let us be as hospitable with that house as with our private dwellings: "Let us not be forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels without knowing them."——A. C.]

GEORGETOWN, Ky., May 29, 1837.

I am returned, about a week past, from a trip of eight or ten days, with brother Walter Scott to Shelbyville, &c. We had an accession of seven persons at Shelbyville. It was a matter of great joy to the brethren.

We are succeeding tolerably well in donations to the College. We hope for great liberality. We number about 110 in the institution. The reputation of our College stands very high in the United States. We much need a good apparatus, library, &c.

J. T. JOHNSON.

[I am one of those that believe that the education of youth—that all schools and colleges should be in the hands of the most moral and religious men, but that there should be no sectarianism about them: for sectarianism, with me, is neither religion nor morality. The anti-sectarian character of this institution, in my judgment, as much as its learned and talented Faculty, will advance its claims on public patronage. I believe it not only possible, but most profitable to the community, to have schools, colleges, and universities not only literary and moral, but anti-sectarian institutions. This, I am happy to be assured, is not only now, but, so far as predetermination on the part of its patrons and friends can avail, is ever to be a literary and moral, but not a sectarian school. As such, and only as such, I can cordially bid it God speed.——A. C.]

MAURY COUNTY, Tenn., May 16, 1837.

Being unaccustomed to write for the press, and having no personal acquaintance with you, I just sit down in haste to address you a few lines informing you of the progress of reformation in this section. Wherever due exertions are made by the proclaiming brethren, and a proper course observed by the members, the churches are growing.

The little church of which I am a member, was formed four or five years ago, twelve miles south of Columbia, almost entirely by the labors of one proclaimer, William S. Gooch, who, having left a sectarian establishment in order to teach the reformation doctrine, become a fit object for their abuse and hatred. He continued teaching, with some occasional help, for some time. The small number continued to increase until there were a considerable number of us, and we began to consider ourselves quite strong. But, alas! that wicked spirit, neglect, that soon got among us, spreading its baneful influence far and near, had very nigh ruined our prosperous little band. We continued in this apostate state until we became as contemptible in the eyes of the surrounding sects as we had before been dreaded. We at length became ashamed of ourselves, and resolved to endeavor to amend our conduct, which we are now trying to do.

We can easily perceive the advantages of a reformation among ourselves; for we are growing very rapidly every week. Fifteen or twenty

Digitized by Google

have been added lately by being "baptized for the remission of sins." More are constantly expected.

A few days ago we had a meeting for the purpose of introducing two young candidates into the kingdom of heaven. After attending to this solemn duty, we retired to a house close by, where a few remarks were made; after which an invitation was given to the people to come and be baptized into Jesus Christ; when, to our inexpressible satisfaction, six came forward to obey the mandate of Heaven. They, or five of them at least, were baptized early next morning "for the remission of sins." The prospect here is very promising for spreading the principles of the reformation. O! may we all reform our own lives until we arrive at that correct standard of inspiration, the Word of God! Then, and not till then, will our neighbors and friends see the beauty of holiness exemplified in our godly walk, and be persuaded to accept the offers of Divine Mercy. M. P. EDWARDS.

[Perhaps a little more forbearance and good feeling on the part of the faithful would prevent much of that "hatred and abuse" of which brethren often complain. Righteousness we know is often persecuted: still we enjoy much less persecution for righteousness' sake than we could wish, and suffer too much reprobation for the sake of our own too unsparing and wholesale censoriousness. I do not speak thus of the brethren in Maury county, but in many other counties; and would humbly suggest the expediency at the present time of all possible mildness and gentleness, that when we are "hated and abused" we may have a "great reward in heaven."——A. C.]

RANDOLPH COUNTY, Ia., May 31, 1837.

I again have the pleasure of sending you good news. The glorious cause is progressing here at a rate that no more surprises than delights us. Brother Hoshour and Hilfield spoke on last Lord's day, when the house would not hold half the people, who were all attention. Five came forward and made the good confession, making in all, since I last addressed you, ten that have been added to our number. There is great rejoicing here. Opposition has nearly ceased. Falsehoods and slanders are all refuted and turned on the head of our enemies, and a general inquiry for truth prevails. Such a call I never heard of as is now for proclaimers throughout several counties in this state. Try, through the medium of your Harbinger, to stir up the brethren to greater action, more liberal contribution, and better co-operation; not to tie their talented men at home, where they are all ready alike to keep house; but to send them abroad to clear the wilderness and plant new vines to the Lord. GEORGE W. SMITH.

DEERFIELD, Portage, O., June 16, 1837.

At our annual meeting at Shalersville, two weeks ago, we had a very general attendance. Our Presbyterian friends were very kind, allowing us the use of their house: which, however, not being sufficiently commodious on the Lord's day, we occupied both it and the town-house. It was a high day of Christian enjoyment, and all present seemed much animated with the blessings of the gospel. These are our yearly festivals; and we appointed another to be held next year at Ravenna, commencing Friday before the first Sunday in June. In this county, and on its borders, there have been thirty-five immersed within three or four weeks, including this meeting.

Brother C., what are we to do to obtain more speakers? I could weep to hear the calls that are made, without any to answer them. My strength is failing, and I find I must desist from so much speaking. I thank Heaven that you have so much physical ability. A. S. H.

Digitized by Google

Mount Gilboa, Louisiana county, Va., May 14, 1837.

The undersigned, members of the church at Mount Gilboa, Louisa, Va., unite in announcing the removal of our beloved brethren Uriah Higgason and William B. Sims, together with their amiable families, to the state of Missouri. Being warmly attached to them, and much distressed on account of the loss we have sustained by the removal of brethren endeared to us by many considerations, we cannot but speak of them out of the abundance of our hearts.

Brother Higgason was a member of the church at Southanna, (Louisa,) and brother Sims of the church at Gilboa. As a teacher of the Christian religion and a proclaimer of the ancient gospel, brother Higgason has labored amongst us for many years with great ability and unflinching firmness, and with considerable success, considering the unparallelled prejudice and unrelenting opposition he had to encounter. Such are our obligations to him for the good he has done amongst us, that we can never cease to love him as one of the best of men, the most useful and exemplary of Christians, whose superior in every respect we do not remember to have seen—but it is the Lord's will that we should lose him, and we should feel resigned to our irreparable loss, feeling well assured from a long acquaintance with him, that his talents and Christian virtues will be seen and felt wherever he may go.

Brother Sims has acted as Agent for the Harbinger for years—his zeal and faithfulness you therefore know how to appreciate. He has also acted as a Deacon amongst us for a long time, and with so much propriety as to have purchased for himself an excellent degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Such brethren as the above, and such women as their wives, who also are our sisters in the Lord, cannot fail to be ornaments to any society, and efficient agents in the advancement of truth.

[Signed by] Madison Pendleton, Peter S. Barret, William D. Hunter, Francis Johnson, Thomas G. Noel, Richard Sims, Joseph Sims, Joseph Coates, Jr. Nelson Walton, Andrew G. Walton, E. Pendleton.

[I cordially concur with the opinions and views above expressed; and as far back as my acquaintance with these brethren, either by correspondence or otherwise extends, were it necessary I would add my signature to theirs.——A. C.]

Tazwell County, Ill., April 3, 1837.

I settled at this place in the autumn of 1830: at that time I was the only individual that I knew of who had determined to conform to the teaching of the Apostles in principle and practice, who lived in this county or M'Clean; and I being only a private character, and meeting with opposition, felt and lamented the influence of the gloomy circumstances with which I was surrounded; but sometime in the course of the year 1831 a brother Oatman, a teaching brother, from Indiana, settled in M'Clean county, about 20 miles distant from me. I was truly gratified on becoming acquainted with him, and prevailed on him to preach in my house, which he continued to do once-a-month for some time; and in the spring of 1833 we were about six or eight in number, united together as a church, agreeing to be governed by the New Testament in faith and practice. In the fall of that year brother Oatman immersed seven for remission of sins, who were added to our number, and a few others were received by letters of recommendation. The same fall brethren William T. Major and James A. Lindsey, from Ken-

Digitized by Google

tucky, visited us and immersed several others, who joined us. From that time until last July we had several additions. In the course of July, August, and September last we were visited with seasons of refreshment truly, for I had the pleasure of seeing thirty-one of my neighbors obey the gospel in the ancient way, and for the same purpose; amongst whom were two of my children. These having given themselves to the Lord and then to us, makes our number about seventy.

Our order is as follows:—We have three Elders and two Deacons. We meet commonly every Lord's day to worship. We first offer the sacrifice of praise; namely, the fruit of our lips in singing. We next attend to prayers; then, to the reading of the Word; then, to teaching and exhortation; then, to the Lord's supper; then, to contribution; then, singing; then, to prayers for the poor, and dismiss. Brother James A. Lindsey, one of our elders, is our principal teacher.

In the course of last summer and autumn our brethren at Walnut Grove, about 20 miles north of this, in brother Oatman's vicinity, were greatly blessed: there were sixty or seventy immersed for the remission of sins and added to the church, and a goodly number of the old Baptist brethren united with them, and they are striving to walk in the ancient order.

There are several other congregations in the counties of M'Clean and Tazwell, which were constituted in the last season: one in Dillon's settlement, one on Mackinaw, and one on Panther Creek. The one in Dillon's settlement has no public teacher. They are about fifteen in number. They meet every Lord's day to pray, praise, read the Word, and break bread, and exhort each other to love and good works.

Dear brother, I rejoice to inform you that in the last four years the prospects in favor of the ancient gospel and order of things has much changed in the counties of Tazwell and M'Clean. We have some six or eight intelligent teachers and upwards of five hundred disciples, and many of the brethren are men of intelligence.

T. F. RAILSBACK.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

The following epistle is from the pen of our excellent and much beloved brother Albert Anderson, one of the faithful evangelists of Eastern Virginia. From my first acquaintance with brother Anderson till now, I have always esteemed and loved him as "an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no guile." It is not on slight grounds of evidence that I would differ even in an opinion from a brother in whose intelligence, purity, and devotion I have so much confidence. I differ from him in some of the views which he has taken of the course of the Apostolic Advocate and the Millennial Harbinger. I shall hear him, however, with all candor and respect. A. C.

To such of the disciples as it may concern, a fellow-disciple wishes *health, sound health* in the faith. James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, writes, "Do not become many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive a severer sentence. For in many things we all offend. If any one offend not in word, he is a perfect man, able to rule also the whole body." See the 3d chapter of James, and *read it attentively*, and *get it by heart*, and *don't forget it, keeping it in memory by doing it.* We all agree that his injunctions are carried into effect by submitting to the divinely inspired teachers *alone* and *only*.

Digitized by Google

It was to the Apostles Jesus said, "Teaching them to observe all the things which I have commanded you." Now, beloved, who of us will presume to be teaching any thing which those teachers have not been teaching? *Then*, ought we not to prefer some humble name? What are we when considered in relation to the Prophets and Apostles, with the Lord Jesus at their head? What are we more than school children? True, some are younger, some older; some are more advanced in knowledge than others; but all are nothing more than disciples or learners in the school. Sometimes one scholar will tell another the meaning of a word or sentence; but *then* he, the *scholar*, is not *the teacher for all this*. The teacher is to decide any matter between the taught. But a difficulty may arise in one school from the consideration that our great Teacher and his divinely commissioned teachers are, for a while, *personally absent*. They, however, have given us all necessary instructions in *written words;* but sometimes the scholars differ about the words—yes, *alas!* some who profess to be disciples, have not only differed, but have appeared excited by the difference, or something else, so much as to produce a great deal of distress in the school. These differing disciples (*it is remarkable*) are distingnished for their extraordinary talents and acquirements. And although they are on this account *less excusable* for their aberrations, and under greater obligations to be exemplary, nevertheless they have so managed things as to make themselves *a great deal talked about in the school*, and even to so great a degree as to *disturb the less advanced disciples' attention to the great Teacher!* Now, beloved, what is to be done? They complain of each other; they appear to a number of their school-fellows as being *both* in *fault*. Too much personality has evidently been indulged in. Ought they not to make acknowledgments? Both profess to be Christians: why not both try to excel in Christian tenderness and love, and yet not at all compromise the truth! Our *great Master* when he *was reviled* did not revile in return! It is respectfully and affectionately suggested to both, that they endeavor to lay aside the very *appearance* of evil, and to set before the schools examples of disciples exulting not in knowledge only, but in love;—"knowledge *puffs* up, but love *builds* up." The hearts of some have been made sick by this long protracted and unhappily managed affair. They have been, however, *forcibly*, though *sadly* impressed by experience with the truth of the divine admonition, not to trust in man, nor to make flesh their arm.

There is also a fault in some of the other disciples, and it is *that* of blaming *altogether*, or almost altogether, either the one or the other of the above referred to two persons. We have an instance of this in the disciple (brother Henley) from East Virginia, who has lately, instead of correcting the faults of both, appeared to have cast the blame altogether on one side, and *thereby* he *appears* to some of us to encourage a party spirit. It is respectfully and affectionately suggested to brother H. that he will reconsider matters, bearing in mind that we shall soon have to stand before the great Master of all. Brethren, let us love one another as Christ has loved us, and make all men know that we are *his* disciples. There is reason to fear we have learned very little of the lesson on loving one another, and on confessing *flat footedly*, that is *plainly*, our faults, one to another. Also, there appears too much proneness to be excited to anger. Let us be strong in the Lord,

Digitized by Google

to do and suffer his will, as Jesus has set us an example. May the peace which flows from the wisdom that is first *pure*, abound more and more to all the beloved disciples, is the prayer of their fellow-disciple,

ALBERT ANDERSON.

New Brunswick, Va. 2d June, 1837.

June 9th, 1837.

P. S. When writing the above I had not seen the May number of the Advocate. It appears to me that brother Thomas has said enough in that to satisfy brother Campbell himself, and the brethren, in reference to all the matters of complaint between them, save only the matter in his January number. This only needs such an explanation as brother Thomas gave me, when but some few of that number had been *sent out*. We certainly had a right to look for far better things in our brother of the Harbinger, than in him of the Advocate; we had this right by consideration of his *superiority in age, experience*, —— "Days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom." Job. The late difficulties have had on myself the effect of endearing more than ever to my heart the refreshing company of the ancient Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, and the *God* of the said *ancient ones*. He who loves their company in *time*, will *doubtless* be admitted into *it* in the *eternal kingdom*, and be comforted in and by *their fellowship*, although he may not be owned for a brother by some of modern times.

A. ANDERSON.

To this I reply in brief—

1st. The brother seems not to have exactly hit upon the meaning of his quotation from James. I understand it in our idiom thus: Do not become many critics, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive less lenity from the many we censure—or that we shall receive a severer censure;—equivalent to, Condemn not, that you be not condemned: for with what measure you mete it shall be measure to you again.

2d. I am not conscious of having on any occasion offended against truth, propriety, or Christian obligation, in my attempts to prevent the ill consequences which I anticipated from the dogmatism of the Apostolic Advocate. I have faithfully and affectionately, however imperfectly, set my face first in the greatest mildness, and afterwards with a little more point and sternness, against the untaught questions—the alienating, if not schismatic movements of the Apostolic Advocate. If, however, this brother, or any other, can direct me to an expression uncalled for or unkind, in any thing I have written on the course of this Editor, I am always disposed to offer an ample apology. But at present, not having read those essays a second time, I have none that I can in truth or candor offer.

3d. Brother Anderson and I regard in very different lights the article referred to in the May number of the Apostolic Advocate. I will not express any opinion of its merits, farther than I regard it much more in the light of a boastful challenge, than in that of a Christian apology; and, as such, I shall not disturb its repose by becoming one of those many severe critics of which James the Apostle spoke. What I have already said may furnish matter for a dozen of pages more.

I have yet some sympathy for my friend Andrew Broaddus, although we may differ as much on some points as I differ from the Apostolic Advocate; and although he once proscribed me from his communion, still I think a very full apology is due to him from the same quarter as well as to myself. I am of the same opinion also as respects Elder William Jones of London, and the father of the Apostolic Advocate.

4th. We Virginians differ from Job and Elihu and all the wise men of ancient times, and therefore I must dissent from my brother Anderson in his allusions to Job. In old times wisdom was expected from the aged, and men of years were allowed to speak. But in the present day, and amongst us Virginians, wisdom is found amongst the young; children are wiser than their parents, and pupils more intelligent than their teachers; and therefore the fathers must look up to their children, and always treat them not merely as equals, but as superiors. But this is the era of the march of mind, when babes challenge the world, and the men of years are but infants of days. Besides, all Christians are full grown men and perfect equals, and the speculation, or opinion, or vote of any one of them is as good as another!!

We have no Apostles, no Prophets, and the inference is inevitable that all are equals in every respect, save one, and that is, that owing to the improvements of the age the young are not only more bold and daring and full of challenge, but are really wiser and much more infallible than their parents and preceptors. This, however, is a part of the glory of the

Digitized by Google

latter day: for there shall be no more an infant of days—i. e. that as soon as a person is baptized he has "more understanding than all his teachers," and is just such a one as king David; for "the least of them shall be as David, and David shall be as the angel of the Lord"!!! A. C.

MARION, Franklin county, Pa., June 6, 1837.

Brother Campbell,

Two weeks ago, being at brother Funk's in Maryland, on Beaver creek, I had the pleasure of a glance at your recent debate with Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati. I discovered my name in front of a few broken phrases purporting to be a part of the account of a discussion between Messrs. G. and F. and brother L. and myself. The *version* given by the Bishop is not good, either as respects the purpose for which he translated it from the Harbinger, or as it respects its comparison with the original copy. It may be that you have it as the stenographer had placed it; but it is not a true copy from the Harbinger, as you will see by comparing his quotation with the original (Millennial Harbinger, page 570.) If you think it worth correcting, you may correct in the Millennial Harbinger that part where he makes me to say, "*I* spoke against these things, contradicting," &c.; whereas the speaking against and contradicting had reference to the other gentlemen speaking in opposition to what we said. It is not the language made use of by me at all. I did not get to read the Debate yet; I only read a few pages. I expect from the specimen read by me, that the Bishop has given in his effort a pretty true definition of the ancient name BABYLON. Rev. xvii. 5.

LAUNCELOT BELL.

To have corrected all the little errors of the Bishop in his facts and documents, as well as in his reasonings, would have greatly impeded our course. The reader as well as the hearer would have been lost in the mazes of the little devious paths which would have been crowding upon him at every few steps of his journey. We only noticed the great generic errors, the gigantic strides by which the Man of Sin assumed a world in each hand—the seen in his right hand, and the unseen in his left. A. C.

HEBRON, Washington county, N. Y., May 31, 1837.

My dear Sir,

SOME time in January or February last I wrote you a letter, stating that through the blessing of God and the instrumentality of your defence of the *ancient gospel*, I had espoused the cause of reformation and set the malice of sectarianism at defiance. Now as the longer I live the more I realize the injurious tendency and persecuting spirit of the popular systems of religion, and thinking perhaps my communication has not reached you, and as the Harbinger has an extensive circulation and will descend to posterity as a book of reference, on whose pages may be found the masterly efforts of those generous, disinterested, and magnanimous spirits who have sacrificed (in a temporal sense) their ease, property, and popularity with a misguided public, and a self-constituted priesthood, to defend the purity of our holy religion and the majesty of God's Word; I wish to enter upon its pages my unqualified and unconditional renunciation of all creeds authoritative, formularies, or directories of worship, confessions, &c. which are the offspring of man's wisdom, which I consider an unhallowed attempt to improve the diction of the Holy Spirit, and nothing better than an impeachment of the veracity of the Most High. I acknowledge Jesus Christ as the only and supreme lawgiver in his kingdom; and his holy Evangelists and Apostles, officially commissioned by him and inspired by his unerring

Digitized by Google

and holy spirit as the only infallible guide and directory for faith and practice; believing that in his last Will and Testament he has bequeathed, through faith in his name and obedience to his laws, the present salvation of my soul from the dominion, power, and pollution of sin, 1 Peter i. 8, 9.; and the future salvation of my body from the corruption of the grave and the power of death, 1 Peter i. 3, 4. You will doubtless recollect me when I tell you I am the individual who had a few moments' conversation with you on the subject of the Holy Spirit's influence in the salvation of man, while sitting before the altar in the meeting-house at Pawlet, Rutland county, during the interval of worship on Lord's day in July last. Your discourses on that day and the day previous aroused me; and although you were condemned by the faithful adherents and admirers of John Calvin, resolving "nothing to extenuate or set down aught in malice," I determined to search for myself, (allowing no man on earth to be my master,) and to try you by the Word of God. I had your Extra on Regeneration, which had been lying in my office some two or three years, having once read it very cursorily, and thought no more of it. And now came "the tug of war;" with the blessed volume of God's truth before me and the Extra in hand, I commenced a thorough and searching investigation of its contents, and determined never to yield an inch but at the point of the sword of the Spirit. This only served to increase my anxiety to find the truth a thousand fold. I began to perceive the foundation of that system I gloried in (Presbyterianism) sensibly gliding from under me: suffice it to say, I procured from brother Isaac Sheldon your "Extra Defended," in which, like the Roman General, you carried the war into Carthage, and not only repulsed every charge the enemy made, but drove him from his entrenchments, and so completely dissected the creature Scholastic Theology, that, in my opinion, its warmest advocates can never heal its mutilated carcass. This tore the vail from my eyes, and to me it is a wonder of wonders how mankind can be thus duped and lend themselves willing instruments to perpetuate systems, or a form of religion, which, to say the least, originated in a misapprehension of the glorious gospel of our adorable Saviour—systems wholly destitute of the charms and soul-subduing power of the gospel—and inoperative when deprived of the aliment that affords them nourishment; to wit, the fears, cupidity, and ignorance of the multitude, and the efforts of artful and designing men. I would not be understood as intimating that all who are satisfied with the present order of things are enemies of our Lord: far be it from me. While I arraign the system, I arraign not the personal piety of its advocates. I know many who I admire as devoted followers of our Lord and Master. Although there is a strong predisposition among the sects to frown down all those who differ in matters of opinion from them, charity compels me to attribute it more to misapprehension of that which they condemn in others, than to a wicked desire to calumniate. But I must say, there seems to be an unaccountable dullness, particularly on the part of the clergy, to understand the principles of that reformation for which you are so successfully pleading: whether this is real or feigned, they best know: if the latter, theirs is a tremendous responsibility: he who knows his master's will, and does it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. Some of the priesthood in this vicinity have represented you as teaching that immersion, pre-

Digitized by Google

ceded by just saying they believe that Jesus the Nazarene was the Son of God, qualifies them for a seat in heaven, and cleanses them from all former, as well as all sins committed after, immersion! But I shall weary your patience, and therefore hasten to close. Preferring the approbation of Him who purchased redemption for guilty man, at the expense of his life, to that of the world, I have been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for the remission of my sins; believing all that is written in the Law and the Prophets, and build upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone; having an answer to every one who asketh me a reason of the hope that is in me, the word and promises of the immutable Jehovah; in consequence of which my brethren of the church to which I belonged (Presbyterian) have judged me to be unworthy of the privileges and immunities of the same, having adjudged me by their creed (of Westminster memory) to be a *heretic;* and, as such, have suspended me! for which, and all the hard things which have been said, may the Lord forgive them; for I have been much misrepresented and calumniated. I rejoice that although I have been thrust out of the kingdom of the clergy, yet if I demean myself as a faithful disciple of the Lord Jesus, no power on earth can deprive me of citizenship in that kingdom which he set up in the "reign of the Cesars," and of membership in that church which he purchased with his own blood. I rejoice also that I am counted worthy to suffer reproach for his name.

May the good Lord bless you and preserve you long to plead his cause, and that you may in all things prove yourself a pattern of good works, and in teaching showing incorruptness and sound speech which cannot be condemned, is the prayer of your friend and brother in the hope of a blessed immortality.

CHARLES JONES WHITE.

P. S. Since my immersion, my wife has also been immersed for the remission of her sins, on the profession of her faith; and my father, who left my residence last winter, declared his determination to do the same. He is also a member of the Presbyterian church.

C. J. WHITE.

This excellent brother, of whom I have but a slight recollection, but of whom I have a good report, is, I think, eminently qualified to be useful in the kingdom of the Messiah. As truth and love have made him Christ's freeman, I pray that by truth and love he may be the means of emancipating many who are enslaved to human systems, as well as inducing those in their sins to repent and obey the gospel. A.-C.

BAPTIST CONVENTION FOR OHIO—1837.

From the 11th Annual Report of the Baptist Convention for the State of Ohio, published in the Cross and Journal of the 16th June, we learn the following facts:—That labor in the work of evangelizing, to the amount of 39 months, by 12 preachers, has been performed during the past year. These travelled more than 10,000 miles, delivered more than 866 sermons, baptized 48 persons, and collected for the Convention $223,56. I think our Baptist brethren had better read Mr. Dick on *covetousness*, especially those of Ohio. The Second Baptist Church in Richmond, under the pastoral care of Elder Taylor, some two or three years ago, as I learned, not from the public press either, contributed some 2,500 dollars in one year for religious uses. I believe much in that sort of religion that enlarges the soul a few inches. A. C.

Digitized by Google

☞ In reply to a very earnest and affectionate request from brother Anderson and many others with him, to visit some parts in the east and south of Virginia in August or September next, I must say—that, having all the duties of my office on my shoulders, (brother Richardson being absent,) as well as owing to other obligations and engagements, it is not possible, however gratifying it might be to myself and them, to visit them at that time. My present engagements run out into next winter, should I live so long. A. C.

☞ We waited to the 28th day of this month for Mr. Skinner's letter, and yet not forthcoming. We had reluctantly to go to press without it.——*June*, 1837.

☞ We ask for more time to answer the Queries on hand.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE VOICE.

THE VOICE of one crying in the Wilderness, being an Essay to extend the Reformation —by *Francis Whitfield Emmons*, Emmaus, Ia. 'And after the fire a still small voice.' Magna et omnipotens est veritas et prevalebit. Noblesville: L. H. Emmons, Printer. 1837. Price 18¾ cts. per number, or 50 cts. per volume, complete in three numbers: 216 pages, 32 mos.

THE CHRISTIAN.

THE CHRISTIAN, to be published weekly in Boston, Mass.; Elder *J. V. Himes*, Editor. One Dollar per annum, in advance. It proposes to advocate Christianity as it is found in the Scriptures, free from the fables of men, and to assist in carrying forward all the great moral and religious enterprizes of the day, &c. &c. Four pages quarto.

THE MORNING WATCH.

Prospectus for the MORNING WATCH.—The subscribers propose with the beginning of the next year, to issue a monthly religious periodical. The objects contemplated may be classed under the following heads, viz.—1. A return to the first principles of Christianity. 2. The union of all who believe in the Son of God. 3. The extension of his kingdom over those who are now out of it. 4. The exhibition of that class of scripture prophecy which proves the *speedy personal return* of Messiah the Son of God and King of glory, to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son; and, for the complete salvation of them that look for and love his appearing.

It will be admitted that these objects are of the highest importance; and that the best and most efficient means of accomplishing them are found in God's word. To *that* Word we design, in the proposed periodical, to direct the attention of all.

In ascertaining its meaning we will apply no private rules of interpretation, but will use only such as are admitted to be correct by the enlightened of all parties. We have no sectarian partialities or prejudices; but are resolved, without fear or affection, to advocate such of the views and so much of the order of the different sects, as shall be found upon careful examination to be consistent with, or authorized by, the word and testimony of God.

Out of the present moral and religious chaos we will endeavor to bring that *pure gospel* and that *beautiful order* which was proclaimed & established by the *Apostles of the Lamb*.

We shall be happy in the prosecution of this great work to receive the assistance of all the intelligent. All who may write with decency and moderation, shall be permitted to address our readers.

Fully convinced as we are, that "all who believe in *Christ* should compose *one body* or *kingdom*," of which He should be the head; that "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, will be rendered to every soul of man that doeth evil—to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile;" and that Christ will shortly appear and stand upon the earth to accomplish the great purposes of his second coming, we cannot but entreat all who love either God or man, to aid us in this matter. We solemnly promise, to the best of our ability, to be faithful and true to God—to his Word, and to our readers.

We expect to have the benefit of some European works never published in America, as well as the promised assistance of the most intelligent men in all the Southern States.

The above periodical will be issued at Evergreen, Anderson district, S. C.; and will consist of 32 large 8vo. pages, at Two Dollars per annum—fair type and paper, and conducted by

JOHN M. BARNES,
CHARLES F. H SHEHANE.

We learn that much is likely to be accomplished in the Southern States if this periodical can be sustained. Brother Barnes is favorably known to the whole State as (not long since) a very accomplished Baptist Preacher—and certainly nothing the worse for having reformed. Brother Shehane is also well known to many of the brethren, and very ardent in the cause of a scriptural reformation. These brethren have much in their power, if sustained in this undertaking. To give them a fair start, the liberality of those enjoying the blessings of the reign of favor is requisite—and shall it be withholden?

A. C.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER VIII.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *August,* 1837.

From the Cross and Journal.

THE INFLUENCES OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

[CONTINUED.]

Now, though we may not be able to define the *nature* of the power which the Holy Spirit employs in renewing men, yet of one thing we have an absolute certainty in our knowledge. *It is not by mere moral power.* This may be illustrated in a very easy manner. A person wishes to carry a certain point with his neighbor. He expresses all the arguments he has to offer on this point. His neighbor attends to the arguments and *fully comprehends them.* This being the case, this person has not only exerted, but *developed* his whole moral power. He can do no more. Suppose this point carried to be an important duty which the neighbor *hates* to do, and is *unwilling* to do, notwithstanding he is convinced he ought to do it. Is he *changed?* No, his disposition remains the same. He *will not* do it. How is this man to be made willing? All moral power is at an end. Apply this to the Holy Spirit. He employs arguments written in the Old and New Testament. In doing this he exerts his whole moral power. But many pay no attention to the arguments, and of course it is not in the power of the Spirit to renew them. But suppose they do attend to the arguments, and yet do not *comprehend* them. In what consists their *guilt?* They either have not *capacity* to understand the arguments, or their natural depravity blinds their minds to the force of truth. If they have not capacity to understand, they cannot be renewed, nor can they be guilty for not doing what they have no ability to comprehend. If their natural depravity, their enmity to holiness blinds their minds to the force of the arguments, they are indeed guilty; but how is this state of mind to be removed? The Holy Spirit has

Digitized by Google

spent all his moral power in his arguments; but all his power is useless, until the sinner comprehends their force, and until the cause of his ignorance is removed. It is not therefore in the power of the Holy Spirit to renew any man, unless he *fully understands* his arguments—and in order to the comprehension of them, the depraved state of his heart must be changed. He could not by *any power* be converted to God. But suppose a sinner fully comprehends the arguments and thus the whole moral power of the Spirit is *fully developed*, he is then *renewed*, or not *renewed*. If he is still unwilling to submit himself to Christ, then what power in heaven or earth can change him, upon Mr. Campbell's view of divine influence.—Hear what God says, "*Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.*"

What then is moral power but *light* communicated to the understanding through the utterance or exhibition of truth? The mind being enlightened and convinced, the heart is supposed to yield itself to this conviction, and thus becomes changed. This view might be sustained if there were not in men an absolute disrelish of spiritual subjects. Without a relish for these no discoveries of them, however clear, can render them pleasing to the soul. On the contrary, the clearer those objects are discovered, the greater will be the disrelish, so long as the taste is not changed. Most persons have a disrelish for castor-oil, and the more *distinctly* and *perfectly* they perceive the taste, the greater is their disrelish. So true is this, that its real taste must be disguised in order to render it tolerable. Now, if all the power which the Holy Spirit employs in renewing and sanctifying men is *moral* power, it is nothing more than the communication of ideas to the mind of the sinner. It has no power to change the carnal mind which is enmity against God. Yet God declares, "Thy people shall be *willing* in the day of thy power." To change the heart is to give it a relish for spiritual objects, and if this relish is not communicated, the heart is manifestly unchanged. If, then, the whole power of the Spirit is *moral*, the Spirit *has never yet renewed* a *soul*. This conclusion is inevitable; for if the whole power is exhausted in communicating ideas to the mind, and yet the sinner should have no relish for spiritual objects, the Holy Spirit has done nothing towards the change of that sinner's heart. If his heart becomes changed at all, *he must do it himself*, for the Holy Spirit has exhausted all his strength. The grand difficulty to be overcome remains, *a disrelish for spiritual objects, a heart enmity against God.* I am aware that there is a way by which to escape this conclusion, but it is only by being involved in one still more perplexing. Even Mr. Campbell himself will prefer the least of two evils. It is not my business, however, to anticipate a worse dilemma.

Digitized by Google

But if the power is neither physical nor purely moral, what is it? It is partly *moral*, and partly *supernatural; moral*, so far as moral means are employed, *and supernatural* in giving efficacy to these means.

Such an influence has been recognized by holy men in all ages, under the Old Testament and under the New.

David says, "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." "Make me to understand the way of thy precepts: so shall I talk of thy wondrous works." "Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, and I shall keep it unto the end." "Give me to understand, and I shall keep thy law; yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart." Ps. cxix. 18, 27, 33, 34. No command is necessary. Here is prayer for an influence upon the heart over and above mere *moral* influence. It is well that these are inspired passages; for if they were not, David's soundness of faith would be questioned.

On another occasion he prayed, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." The Lord by the Prophet Ezekiel says, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." To give a new heart, is equivalent to putting his spirit within them, and the result was to be devotion to the Lord. The Apostle Paul writing to the Ephesians, says, "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his spirit, in the inner man." To the Colossians he writes, "For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding; that ye might walk worthy of the Lord, unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness."

It may be said that these were believers in Christ to whom the gift of the Holy Spirit was promised. But this does not alter the nature of the influence. Paul prayed for *supernatural aid* upon his brethren with a view to their *personal holiness* and *usefulness*. There is consequently such a power, though we may be unable to define. It was not prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit in his miraculous influences, for this was not necessarily connected with the formation of personal character. It is recorded of Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul." How did the

Digitized by Google

Lord open her heart? Not by miracles, for there is no evidence that any were yet wrought in Philippi; and Mr. Campbell himself says, "*miracles cannot convert*." It was not by moral power, for this could not have been fully developed unless Lydia fully comprehended the arguments. And it is very certain that she could not have comprehended them, unless she had first given *attention* to them. But her heart was *first opened*, so that she *did attend* to Paul.

Is it not the duty of believers to come boldly to a throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need? If all the influence of the Holy Spirit is in the words recorded in the Old and New Testament, and we have these in our possession, why pray for grace to help in time of need!

But the most astonishing proof of such supernatural influence is found in the address of Mr. Campbell to the disciples near the close of the work called *Christianity Restored*. He says, "The Lord has promised his Holy Spirit to them that ask him in truth; and is it not necessary to our success? If it be not necessary to give new revelations, it is necessary *to keep in mind those already given, and to bring the word written seasonably to our remembrance*." Now by what kind of influence is the word brought seasonably to our remembrance? Is it *physical*? Is it *moral*? Or is it *supernatural*? Recall Mr. Campbell's view, that the spirit can exert no greater influence upon the human mind than is found in the arguments which are written in the New Testament; and that the Holy Spirit puts forth *all* its *converting* and *sanctifying power*, in the words which it fills with its ideas.

I ask in conclusion, if the Holy Spirit can *seasonably* bring to remembrance the written word in the mind of the believer, can he not with equal ease, bring the same word *seasonably* to the mind of a sinner, and by that very word strike dismay to his heart? And when that sinner feels that the eternal indignation of Jehovah is his due, and under the influence of aburdened spirit cries for mercy through Christ, cannot the Holy Spirit with the same facility bring a portion of the written word to his remembrance *seasonably*, so as to fill him with confidence in Christ, and with inexpressible joy? Does not the Holy Spirit in each instance bring the gospel with power to the heart? Let an enlightened community judge.———Yours truly,

S. W. LYND.

Mr. LYND, while he admits that he may not be able to define the power which the Spirit of God employs in renewing man, is nevertheless certain, absolutely certain that "*it is not by mere moral power*." Now I do not say that Mr. Lynd's opinion is absolutely erroneous: I only say that, to me, he has not proved it to

Digitized by Google

be true. I wish, indeed, it were in his power to give us some assurance on this subject. It would greatly relieve us from many inconveniences.

I shall then briefly notice where his illustration and argument fail. He says, "A person wishes to carry a certain point with his neighbor. He offers all his arguments, and they are fully comprehended by his neighbor. He has therefore spent all his moral power, and his neighbor is convinced; but he hates to yield to his convictions. *His disposition is unchanged.* Now the question comes, How is his disposition to be changed? Not by moral power, for that is all spent." So he reasons. He supposes as the case is made out, that *moral power may fully convince, but cannot dispose.* The *disposing* power he infers is distinct from the *convincing* power. The former is moral; the latter is something else than moral; but it is not physical. What shall we call it! Aye—that is the question. We shall have his answer in a few periods hence.

Meanwhile, we must mark the failure in the case alleged. It is assumed that a person may attentively hear, understand, and fully comprehend the whole of a moral argument to perfect conviction of its truth and excellence, and yet remain indisposed to the object presented. Ought not this first to have been proved? Is it not a begging of the question to take this for granted? And this not being proved, the illustration and argument fall to the ground.

Show me the man living who has fully attended to the whole argument of the Holy Spirit, and who fully comprehends it, and is yet indisposed; or let him point to such a case on record. Persons may be named, living and dead, who in various measures have understood and comprehended the arguments or motives of the Holy Spirit, and yet were never fully disposed to give up their hearts to the Lord. But will these prove that *full conviction is not full persuasion!* A fully convinced person, yet remaining indisposed, very much resembles a white crow or a black swan. I should like to see one.

Still I would not rashly cavil at Mr. Lynd's theory, or dissent from it, because of a mere verbal inaccuracy or illogical definition. I would, however, submit to his reflection, that the arguments of the Holy Spirit are addressed not only to the head, but to the heart. They are not mere *light*, but *love*. They speak to the understanding, the conscience, the affections. Now that a person may fully understand and comprehend these, and yet remain indisposed, has never been to my perception fully proved.

With me disposition must have an object. They are relative terms. Who can explain disposition without an object? A person may hate an object; but he cannot hate without one. To change his disposition the object must be changed, so far as his

Digitized by Google

view of it is concerned. The object must be so far changed as to appear in a new attitude, or color, or relation, else his disposition cannot be changed. When, then, a rational agent attempts to change the disposition of a rational being, he either presents a new object, or an old object in a new light. A power operating upon disposition in any other way than by an object, is to me as inconceivable as seeing without light, or hearing without sound. Who can explain a power operating upon hatred or upon love without means, without truth? He alone may explain hatred and love without an object. But where shall this philosopher be found!

I am, then, constrained to object to the case adduced by Mr. Lynd, because it assumes two positions which have never been proved:—

1st. That a sinner may fully comprehend all the arguments of the Holy Spirit, addressed as they are to the whole moral nature of man, feel all his *moral power* in his understanding, conscience, and heart, and that to full conviction too, and still remain an enemy—alienated and indisposed.

2d. In the second place he supposes that a power not moral can work upon disposition; or, what is the same thing, that disposition may be changed without an object, without motive, without moral considerations.

By his twice quoting with emphasis the words of David—"Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power"—he would seem to indicate that persons are made willing by some other power than moral power, or the power of motive. This text has been often quoted to me in some such sense. Now can any one suppose that people can be *made willing* by power, other than the power of motive, and that is all we mean by moral power! To suppose persons to be forced into willingness, is a contradiction in terms. They are an unwilling willing people without free agency, and consequently without virtue, and therefore cannot be Christ's people.

I have sometimes thought of rescuing this text from such a misapplication, by a dissertation at some length on its true meaning. I cannot now attempt it. I will only observe that David in the 100th Psalm celebrates the coronation of his Son and his investiture with all authority in heaven and earth. "The day of Christ's power" is the whole period of his reign. It is not the special moment of a sinner's conversion, nor the instant in which he is born again, that David denominates "*The day of thy power.*" The day of Madison's power or Jackson's power was not any particular day during their reign, but the whole period of their office. So exactly is it here.

Again, the *willing people* are Christ's volunteers or soldiers,

Digitized by Google

by whom he carries on the war and gains his victories during the day of his power. David says, "Rule (Messiah) in the midst of thine enemies by thy free people in the day of thy power." The English and Scotch read this passage in the Bibles printed by Jacob Backer by the authority of the King, early in the 17th century, as I have it now lying before me in one of those Bibles of 1615—"Be thou ruler in the midst of thine enemies; thy people shall come willingly at the time of assembling thine army in holy beauty; the youth (soldiers) of thy womb *shall be* as the morning dew." This meaning is sustained by the Syriac, Ethiopic, Septuagint, and Coverdale's and Tyndal's English version, and the oldest Anglo-Saxon. The whole connexion even in the common version gives it this meaning.

Another illustration used as an argument, appears to me equally inconclusive. Mr. Lynd truly affirms that "the clearer certain objects are discovered, the greater will be the disrelish." But because the stomach nauseates the castor-oil the more clearly it is perceived; follows it logically that the more clearly any one understands all the moral arguments of the gospel, he will be the more indisposed to receive it!

But again the question recurs, What shall we call this new power, which is neither moral nor physical, which is superadded to the moral power in the work of conversion. Mr. Lynd calls it *supernatural*. But what new idea does this communicate? Have we not supernatural physical, and supernatural moral power! To show how words may be multiplied without ideas, let us take a supposition also:—

A certain Mediator was possessed of both physical and moral power. In prosecuting his mission a question arose about the power employed in a certain case. There were two parties. They both affirmed it was not physical power; but one said neither was it purely moral, but partly moral and partly mediatorial. A debate ensued, which continued for some years. Finally, the respondent argued that as the agent was a *Mediator*, all the power which he employed was *mediatorial* power, whether it was moral or physical, and that the sophism lay in confounding the nature of the agent with the nature of the power. So that a word was added without so much as a shade of a new idea.

I doubt not that already Mr. Lynd sees as distinctly as myself, that *supernatural*, no more than *mediatorial*, when prefixed to power, reaches at all to the nature of the power. Therefore he gains nothing in argument nor in illustration by the prefix, inasmuch as we may have supernatural *physical* as well as supernatural *moral* power. To confound the nature of the agent with the nature of the power is now-a-days a very common error. A gentleman with whom I once debated this point, who has now

Digitized by Google

passed over Jordan, said it was *spiritual* power rather than moral power. The same expose of the case which I have now offered silenced his speculations on that subject. We have spiritual moral and we have spiritual physical power. Still, if I must have a prefix to moral, I would prefer that of Mr. Jennings to that of Mr. Lynd. I would rather prefix to the epithet *moral* the word *spiritual* than the word *supernatural*.

I am not, however, so dogmatical, because I do not feel so confident as to contend that *spiritual* moral power may not greatly transcend *human* moral power. In looking round amongst mankind I discover a very great difference in human moral power. One hundred orators, for example, whether of the bar, of the forum, or of the pulpit, may argue a single case, all the evidence for which is possessed equally by them all; and yet there are as many degrees of excellence, clearness, force, and persuasion in their respective efforts, as there are speakers. Angelic moral power may be greatly superior to human moral power, and certainly it will be conceded that divine moral power as well as divine physical power does incomparably transcend all human, all angelic moral power. This being admitted, what comes of his affirmation that the power in question "is not mere moral power"? Admit the interposition of the Spirit himself, still the power which he employs may be as moral or as physical in its own nature as the power exercised by angels or men is moral or physical independent of their nature.

There are some good old-fashioned preachers, perhaps Mr. Lynd is of their school, who have been greatly offended at the phrase *moral suasion*; and because those moral suasion preachers had very little use for Christ crucified in their sermons, or for evangelical holiness, these have carried their aversion to their moral suasion so far as to transfer a portion of it to moral power. I concur with them in the poverty and leanness of the aforesaid moral suasion, but cannot go so far as to say that the Holy Spirit exerts any other than moral power in converting and sanctifying a sinner.

Motive for mind, and the impulse of weight and motion for matter. We cannot apply motive to stones, nor the impulse of weight and motion to mind. To talk of blowing rocks to pieces by motives or moral arguments, is full as plausible as to talk of converting souls by physical power—I do not care whether the agent be man, or angel, or the Deity.

There is, however, one point remaining in Mr. Lynd's very ingenious and benevolent essay, which is more plausible than those which I have yet noted. This, however, I must reserve for another number. Meanwhile I will only add, that I have a growing affection for a spiritual religion. I feel more and more the

Digitized by Google

need of the sanctification and consolations of the Holy Spirit; I never, indeed, had any affection or partiality for a religion without the Spirit of God. I regard the promise of the Spirit to the church as the most splendid and gracious of all the bequests found in the Last Will and Testament of the Messiah.

Yet orthodoxy with me is heterodoxy whenever it carries its speculations so far as to make the gospel an instrument sufficiently clear and credible to condemn a man without the preternatural agency of Satan, but not sufficiently clear and credible to save a man without the miraculous or supernatural agency of the Spirit of God. The *mere* gospel, as some would have it, is the power of God to condemnation, but not the power of God to salvation to any one who believes it upon its own proper evidence!!! I should like to hear my friend Mr. Lynd, for whom I have a very great respect, deliver himself to my readers on this subject. We are a very inquisitive people—we are not infallible—we go for free discussion—we have open meeting-houses and free presses for all our Protestant brethren; and, except on holy days and sacred occasions, we will even listen to a Romanist—for the sake of being listened to as long. A. C.

Discussion of Universalism.

No. III.

PROPOSITIONS

To be discussed by D. SKINNER, *of Utica, New York; and* A. CAMPBELL, *of Bethany, Va.*

(*Proposed by D. Skinner.*)

I. Are *sheol, hades*, and *gehenna*, (separately or together) ever used in the Scriptures to express a place or state of endless misery?

II. Do the words *olem, aion, aionios*, &c. when applied to the punishment of the wicked, mean duration without end?

III. Is there any word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked, or which can certify us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end?

IV. Shall eternal life (meaning thereby endless holiness and happiness) be, according to the Scriptures, the ultimate destiny of all mankind?

1st. If there must be *four issues* formed in this discussion, to prevent all ambiguity be it remembered that A. Campbell affirms, that, while *sheol, hades*, and *gehenna*, in their original import, only sometimes signify the punishment of the wicked; *gehenna*, by its adjuncts, or as used by Jesus Christ, does denote the *future interminable punishment of the wicked.*

2d. A. Campbell affirms that the whole force of the Hebrew word *olem* is found in the Greek *aion*, and that same force is carried into the adjective *aionios;* which word, when applied to the *future state of both righteous and wicked, does denote duration without end.*

3d. A. Campbell denies that there is in the Greek language any word which, in its unfigurative and original force, denotes *a simple state of duration without end*, save *ton*: and that there is not any word which can certify us that God, angels, or men, will live forever, if *aionios* does not.

4th. A. Campbell denies that eternal life will be the destiny of all men

Digitized by Google

EVIDENCE TO BE RELIED ON.

I. A future state being wholly a matter of revelation, whatever illustrations or corroborations may be drawn from nature, society, or our own reasonings, no other witnesses than the Apostles and Prophets, or the Spirit of God speaking in them, can be admitted as of any authority.

II. That as their testimony on the subject is complete in the Old and New Testaments, especially the latter—to these books, especially the latter, every appeal shall be made.

III. In this discussion the words of the Bible are to be subjected to the canons of criticism or laws of language current in the commonwealth of letters; and no new or by-laws, other than those to which all writings of the same antiquity are subjected, can be admitted in the interpretation of any disputed word or sentence.

IV. That King James' version shall be ultimate in every appeal to translations; or, if the parties choose, the new version on the basis of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge.

RULES OF DISCUSSION.

I. The Universalists having opened the discussion, D. Skinner shall continue to lead the way, and A. Campbell to respond to the close of the discussion.

II. The disputants shall occupy equal space in their respective periodicals.

III. No letter shall extend beyond six pages (*burgeois*) of the Millennial Harbinger.

IV. The discussion shall not transcend twenty letters each, from the first of Mr. Skinner's, February 10th, to the close The last letter, on each side, to be a recapitulation of the arguments of each, and to be simultaneously printed in their respective periodicals.

V. The parties shall, as early as possible, in every month, forward to each other a proof-sheet of their letters.

VI The parties shall always confine themselves to the proposition under discussion, so long as it is agreed to prosecute it; or should they disagree on this point, not more than five letters shall be devoted to any one proposition.

[Signed] A. CAMPBELL.

A. Campbell hereby submits to Mr Skinner the following proposition:—

After the discussion shall have been published in our respective periodicals and in the periodical press, a copy-right for its future publication in the form of a volume shall be tendered to the American and Foreign Bible Society, that the profits accruing from the sale of the work may be consecrated to the distribution of the Word of Life at home and abroad. And should they refuse, it shall be tendered to the American Bible Society; and they refusing, to any benevolent society in which the parties may agree.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

1. *Dear Sir*—YOUR June letter has this day come to hand; and for the promptness with which you have furnished me with the proof, you will please accept my thanks. By your first paragraph it appears that you were not in fault that I did not receive your April letter while in Virginia; but the whole is to be charged to the extreme tardiness of the mails.

2—In your second paragragh you seem to think me wanting in courteousness and grace in my manner of acceding to your requisitions relative to the propositions to be discussed, the evidence and rules to be regarded in the discussion, &c., and you think such compliance on my part evidence that I considered such preliminaries "both necessary and proper." In answer to this, my dear sir, I will simply remark that, as nearly one-half of your letter was occupied with an unsuccessful attempt to show that you had been challenged, and with expressions of astonishment or reproof that I had so hastily rushed into the arena of combat, it did appear to me very much like quibbling and stratagem to evade the real subject of controversy, and bandying of words about challenges, altogether unbecoming the honorable and high-minded Christian controversialist. The requisition for the propositions for discussion appeared to me both puerile and captious, for the reason that they had already been on the carpet of investigation for months, nay, more than a year. And the rules of evidence, and rules for the discussion, (ex-

Digitized by Google

cepting those proposed for fixing the length and manner of closing it,) being in general unexceptionable, and such as all honorable Christian controversialists would be likely to regard just as well without as with a written agreement, I considered entirely unnecessary to be obtruded into what ought to have been a part of the discussion itself. And because I acceded to *these*, you consider it evidence that I regarded all you had said on those topics as "necessary and proper." Your logic here must be peculiar to yourself.

3—We will not quarrel about any "attempts at humor and wit," nor about your "gentle reprimand of Mr. Montgomery's 'modest inquiry.'" If you had thought such things "unworthy of a grave notice" at an earlier day, or before the public had witnessed the boastful pretensions on your part, it would have saved you from the mortification you now evidently feel.

4—One cannot but smile at your sixth paragraph, in which you speak of my "unsuccessful attempt to apologize" and my "evident mortification in having so informally, illogically, and lawlessly rushed into the arena." Apologize? Sir, I *apologize!* for what? Why, for having promptly fulfilled my promise, my positive engagement, and published, as I told you I would in February, 1837, my reply to yours in the Harbinger just one year before that, viz. in February, 1836.—Wonderful precipitancy! Do you think you will ever be guilty of such an act—the prompt fulfilling of an engagement with Universalists? I begin seriously to doubt it, unless the "*bits*" of truth can be put "into your mouth," "the *reins*" of constraint "around your neck," and the *spurs* of compulsion applied to your sides. No, sir, I have no apology to make for promptly meeting *my* engagements. I informed you in November last, that I would commence the publication of the discussion as soon as your convenience would allow you to attend to it. You answered in the same month that you would probably be absent from home from the first of January to the first of February, but said nothing about any preliminaries being necessary, other than the articles already before the public. I then informed you when I would commence, and have kept my word; and not a syllable did I receive from you notifying me that you would not be ready to respond immediately after the first of February, though my February letter probably did not reach your place of residence till past the middle of that month.

5—Your affected *sneers* at the "impotency" of my February letter, your calling it "headless, pointless, wide-spreading declamation," saying "there is not in said letter a single scripture quoted in its true meaning, or a single argument that will bear the line and plummet of sound sense and logical discretion," may pass with our readers for what they are worth—bare unsupported *assertions*. I suppose, however, you think them very "gracefully" made, and with the climax of "courteousness." It is, however, much more convenient for some men to *make* assertions than to *prove* them. But, sir, "there must be something more solid than declamation, more forcible than assertion, more convincing than *ad captandum* appeals to the passions and sinister bias of ungodly men," or, I may add, the prejudices of the followers of a professed reformer, to whom and to whose opinions many of them are as closely wedded as a Romanist ever was to the Pope. You promise hereafter to say something towards convincing the public and even myself of the

Digitized by Google

truth of your assertions. Well, sir, the sooner the better. I pray you may at least *attempt* it without further delay.

6—Your objections to both the alternatives I proposed for closing the discussion clearly evince your unwillingness to meet me on fair and equal grounds, and your apparent intention of evading the discussion unless you can get decidedly the advantage in the arrangements of it. You attempt to *ridicule* the alternative of gradually reducing the letters in length till they come down to half a page in the Harbinger, and call this but a "monosyllable a-piece." If, sir, the Harbinger contains but two syllables to the page, it is a *smaller* concern than I had hitherto regarded it. But why you should object to the other alternative, of closing it by a simultaneous *finale* from each, I cannot conceive, unless it be for the purpose of getting decidedly the advantage. Why should you object to it any more than you did to Bishop Purcell's proposal for an appendix to the Catholic discussion? Can you not use six pages to as good advantage as I can mine? Then it must either be from a deficiency of talents, or the badness of your cause. Even this proposal of mine will be more advantages to you than to me, because it will be allowing you *twelve* pages to my *six*, after the last of the controversy proper.

7—In reply to your sophistical insinuation that I "claim first the choice of a written rather than an oral discussion—then the choice of the propositions, and the choice of leading the way, and of closing too," I will simply remark, that the choice or alternative of an oral discussion was not given me till after the agreement for a written discussion had been entered into; the choice of the propositions was not mine, for they had been already under discussion over a year; as to my "leading the way," after the agreement for my continuing the controversy had been entered into, I think it was very necessary somebody should do it, and I am fully confident you never would have done it; and as to closing it, I allow you quite as large a share in that as I claim myself. You must, I think, mean the *reverse* of what you say, when you state that I have made you the respondent in the two first propositions and myself in the two last. For I suppose he who has the negative of a given proposition, is respondent to him who has the affirmative. But as each of us has two affirmatives and two negatives, and as I have shown that neither myself nor Mr. Montgomery challenged you to a controversy, and moreover as my proposal still gives you the last letter of the controversy proper, before the *finale* from each, I do insist that no reasonable man can ask more of another than I concede to you.

8—I accede to your proposal concerning the *number* of letters, excepting that I would have them begin and be numbered from the time you shall agree that the preliminaries are settled—the next letter after which shall be called No. 1, or if you make no more demurring, this letter shall be called No. 1. May I not then even hope for this, and that already have terminated, "all those trifles, which indeed are mere quibbles and manœuvres to save appearances, alike unmanly and undignified!" and that henceforth our readers will all be edified "with matters more worthy of our pages and more deserving of their attention?" I most heartily respond your expressed wishes and hopes on this subject.

9—I now come to notice what you say upon the first two propositions for discussion. But, really sir, I was not prepared to expect so sudden a relinquishment, or backing out on your part, from the first proposi-

Digitized by Google

tion, and what I had been given to expect you regarded as one of your strongest holds—one of your most inaccessible and invulnerable fastnesses. You now concede even more than I had ever before supposed or claimed that you had conceded, or would concede. True, you do it in such a way as to save appearances all you possibly can. You begin by complaining of my verbiage in wording the first proposition.

10—You object first to the phrase "separately or together" which I had included in a parenthesis, because you say of *sheol, hades, and gehenna*, "they are never used *together* at all." Very well, then leave out the parenthesis: I only added it for your benefit to give you the wider scope, and allow you the privilege, if you could not prove your doctrine by *one* of the words (*sheol, hades, or gehenna,*) in any *one* passage, of doing it by *all* those words in a connected view of *all* the passages where they occur.

11—Your second objection contains the broad concession before adverted to, viz—that these words (*sheol, hades, and gehenna,*) "are noun-substantives; and if fairly rendered, cannot express both the adjective *endless* and substantive *misery*." Of course, then, neither word can express endless misery. Why, then, my dear sir, did you blame me in your April letter for taking your concession to "Spencer" as a frank and *bona fide* concession, or giving up of these words, "as being in themselves insufficient to teach the doctrine of endless misery?" You seemed to take great umbrage that I took that concession as in earnest, and said it was not so intended, but was only made "to save time and labor." I then gave you the liberty of taking it back, and put the proposition in form for you to defend, what I supposed to be, your view of the words. But behold, you have made the concession a second time, and in still broader terms! You have driven the nail through, and even clenched it on the other side! You now not only declare that these words, (rendered hell in our version of the Bible,) "if fairly rendered, *cannot* express both the adjective *endless* and the substantive *misery;*" but in a subsequent part of your letter you say "you can no where find *olem, aion*, or *aionos*, [aionios] applied to *sheol, hades*, or *gehenna!!*" Hear it, O ye heavens! Listen, O earth! Let the world take knowledge of it! Let it be recorded in a book, and never forgotten!—The Rev. Alexander Campbell states, in a set controversy with a Universalist, that SHEOL, HADES, and GEHENNA, IF FAIRLY RENDERED, CANNOT EXPRESS ENDLESS MISERY OF THEMSELVES, OR WITHOUT AN ADJUNCT;—AND THAT WE CAN NO WHERE FIND OLEM, AION, OR AIONIOS (his favorite terms for expressing ENDLESS) APPLIED TO SHEOL, HADES, OR GEHENNA!

12—Our labor, therefore, would seem by this to be concluded so far as these words are concerned. For you can never hereafter predicate the doctrine of endless misery from the force of any or all of these words. Hence your third objection to my form of the question is altogether gratuitous.

13—The proposition you are disposed to substitute for the one I proposed, is in all conscience, singular enough for a Partialist gravely to propose for discussion with a Universalist! "SHEOL, HADES, AND GEHENNA, ARE SOMETIMES USED IN SACRED SCRIPTURE TO EXPRESS A STATE OF MISERY OR PUNISHMENT." Verily, sir, your courage has risen to a wonderful pitch. You are not afraid to take the affirmative of what may almost be denominated a *truism*, a proposition which no enlighten-

Digitized by Google

ed Universalist or Christian of any denomination ever questioned or doubted for one moment!

14—All your labor, sir, in attempting to prove the truth of the above proposition, is entirely the work of supererogation. For I as firmly believe as you do or can, that SHEOL, HADES, AND GEHENNA ARE SOMETIMES USED IN SACRED SCRIPTURE TO EXPRESS A STATE OF MISERY OR PUNISHMENT. It would be infidelity or madness to affect to disbelieve it. And here I might in perfect justice to the subject leave the matter, so far as those words are concerned, and neither notice any of your proof texts, nor allow the subject to be again broached during the pendency of this discussion, for you have conceded all that I ask. But as a matter of courtesy to you and our readers, I will make a few remarks on the words rendered hell, and the passages you quote containing them.

15—1st. The Hebrew SHEOL and Greek HADES, more properly signifies a STATE or CONDITION than a PLACE. It signifies, *first*, literally and commonly, the state or condition (or if you please, the place) of the dead in general, irrespective of their goodness or badness, their happiness or misery. *Secondly*, in a figurative sense, severe judgments, great afflictions, sudden temporal destruction. *Thirdly*, in a moral and figurative sense, a distressing sense of guilt, remorse of conscience, great mental anguish. In the second or third of the foregoing senses, or perhaps both, does David use the word in Psalm ix. 17—"The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God." See and read from the 15th to the 20th verses inclusive, which shows this to be his meaning. In a similar sense also is it used in Prov. xxiii. 14, and Luke xvi. 23, the other two passages you quote in which the word is found. In the third or last sense the Psalmist uses the word in Ps. lxxxvi. 13, and cxvi. 3—"Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest HELL"—"The pains of HELL gat hold upon me." See also Jonah ii. 2.

16—You say I ought to have added TARTARUS to the other two words. I saw no necessity for it, inasmuch as the word occurs but ONCE in the whole Bible, and then in a passage of very doubtful import: (2 Pet. ii. 4.) The case is only a suppositious one, referred to, not for the purpose of giving any new information, but to illustrate an argument of the Apostle. He does not inform, nor can we ascertain who or what the "angels" were to whom he refers. Most likely he refers to some heathen tradition, some apocryphal book, or some fable or story familiar to those whom he addressed, without either affirming or denying its truth, for the sake of illustrating and enforcing the fact that there was a righteous overruling Providence that would equitably reward the righteous and punish the guilty. But, sir, if there had been an apparent necessity for including TARTARUS with the other words, that necessity is now removed by your own concessions. For according to your own definition of it, TARTARUS only represents a part OF HADES; and you say "HADES is to be DESTROYED." Of course, TARTARUS will then exist no longer.

17—With your definition of the origin and primary meaning of GEHENNA, I fully concur. But I do not agree with you that all intelligent Christians knew where gehenna was "long before the days of Universalism," for the very obvious reason that I consider the days of Universalism coeval with the days of Christianity, and its doctrine identical with the latter.

18—I agree with you that generally, (though not always,) the word

Digitized by Google

GEHENNA in the New Testament is used not in its primary and literal, but in a figurative or metaphorical sense. What that figurative sense is, I think has been very clearly shown by Mr. Balfour in his First Inquiry. You are careful, however, not to inform your readers of the sense in which he has shown that our Saviour used the word: but you have set up your own unsupported assumption that it figuratively set forth a place or state of future punishment—i. e. (as you undoubtedly mean, if you use the phrase in its present popular sense) punishment in another state of being. Now, my good friend, although so far as this controversy and its results are concerned, I would not have the least objection to conceding such a *doctrine*, yet as such a conclusion is not in our premises, and I do not choose to allow *assumption* to take the place of *argument*, nor *assertion* that of *proof*, I shall wholly object to that kind of procedure.

19—If mankind generally were liable to GEHENNA punishment in another state of being, how will you account for the well-known fact that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever preached gehenna fire, or gehenna punishment, to any but Jews?—that none of them ever preached or lisped a syllable of it to Gentiles or authorized others to do it?—that no Gentile is ever threatened with it in all the Scriptures? Mr. Balfour has not only admitted that the word gehenna is used figuratively to express the most dreadful punishments, but has actually shown what those punishments were, viz. the woes that were to befall the Jewish nation at the destruction of their city, their temple, their theocracy, etc., etc., when they were to experience such tribulation as there had never been since the beginning of the world, and such as there never should be after that time. Matt. xxiv. 21. Such woes as Moses had predicted should come upon the children of Israel in case of their continued iniquity and disregard of the laws of God. Deut. from ch. xxviii. 15, to xxxii. inclusive. See similar punishments spoken of in Ezek. xxii. 18—22, and other parallel passages. The first proof text you quote, is, in connexion with its context, clearly indicative of this sense and use of GEHENNA.

20—"Fill ye up then," (says Christ, verses 31—36,) "the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: THAT UPON YOU MAY COME ALL THE RIGHTEOUS BLOOD shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zecharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. VERILY I SAY UNTO YOU, ALL THESE THINGS SHALL COME UPON THIS GENERATION." Add to the explicitness of the above language, the fact that the very next verse commences the pathetic lamentation of Jesus over the doomed city, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc. and can any sane and enlightened mind doubt for one moment that by the "damnation of hell" (GEHENNA,) our Saviour here intended to express the approaching temporal woes of the Jews, and the desolation and destruction of their city?

21—The other passage you cite to prove your views, (Matt. x. 28, with its parallel Luke xii. 5,) is probably one of the most plausible ones for your purpose that you could have found in the whole New

Digitized by Google

Testament. But before it can be allowed as affording any proof of your views, I wish you to answer a few questions concerning it. What is the being or power, the disciples of Christ (for *they* are the persons addressed) are exhorted to fear? Are you certain it is God? Does not the context indicate a different power? Are not the disciples particularly called "*friends*," and after being exhorted to "fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell," are they not immediately exhorted to repose *confidence and trust in God* instead of being *frightened* at the thought of his power?—thus, "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. FEAR NOT, THEREFORE: *ye are of more value than many sparrows.*" Might not the Saviour have intended that power (the Roman) that was to be employed in the overthrow and destruction of Jerusalem? What is meant by the word *soul* in Matthew? Luke does not use the word soul at all. Was he deficient in expressing our Saviour's meaning? or, is the word *soul* in Matthew used *expletively*, as in some other passages? (See Matt. ii. 20; vii. 25; Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 20; where it is used either expletively, or else simply to express *person*,) and as is used the word *body* in various places? (See Rom. vi. 6; vii. 24; Col. ii. 11; and many other texts.)

22—Again, granting that the power to be feared was that of God himself, and also that the soul was the surviving spirit or immortal part of man, (which you have made no effort to prove,) what follows? Why, not necessarily the conclusion that any one would *actually be destroyed in gehenna;* but only that God had the *power* to destroy them, the same as he had the *power* to raise up children to Abraham from the literal stones of the field. But suppose him not only to *possess* the power, but actually to *exercise* it, and *literally to destroy both soul and body* in the hell that you believe in—What follows? Why, not *endless misery* surely, not the *preserving* of the soul to endure ceaseless torment, but the *destruction* of the soul—of course the cessation of its happiness and misery—and the annihilation or destruction of the material body of flesh and bones in hell! Therefore, the text in this view would disprove, instead of proving endless misery.

23—You object to the second proposition on account of the suffix "*and so forth.*" Very well, sir, then leave it off. I have no desire it should be there—it was only added for your benefit, to give you the greater scope; though by it I only meant all the forms and variations of *aion*—whether Hebrew, Greek, or English, substantive or adjective, singular or plural—and I presume my readers all understood this to be my intention.

24—But of all the strange requisitions that I ever knew to be made by any reputable theological controversialist, your demand is the strangest—that I should furnish you with "a list of all those passages where *olem*, *aion*, and *aionos*, [*aionios*] are applied to the punishment of the wicked," before you can be prepared to "affirm or deny the second proposition," or "undertake to show that in such places *olem*, *aion*, and *aionios* do mean duration without end!" Although you have heretofore affirmed it substantially and made an effort to establish it! Verily, sir, a new era has arrived in theological controversy, when the respondent to a proposition has not only to negative the proposition and arguments of his opponent, but is also called upon to furnish all the materials and weapons in his power to enable his opponent to sustain *his* side, or the affirmative of the question! Your earnest calls for mercy and help on this subject at the hand of your opponent, may possibly be construed by some into a cry

Digitized by Google

for quarter. I will not, however, so regard it. But, sir, it is not my business to do your work for you. Yours is the affirmative of this question—yours the labor of proving it. It is not my business to furnish you with a list of passages where those words are found and applied to the punishment of the wicked. If those passages are to your purpose, it is your business to look them up and apply them: and may I not hope, kind sir, that you will soon be about it?

Yours, very respectfully,

D. SKINNER.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER.

JUNE 29th, 1837.

1. *My dear Sir*—I HAVE prefixed to your last letter (date unknown) the propositions, rules of discussion, and the evidence to be relied on in the pending controversy. You will see that I have given up the whole matter of discord to your own dictation. I do this, sir, to avoid printing in every letter some three or four pages of matter, which, whatever we may think of it, cannot but be regarded by our readers as more puerile and captious than edifying. With regard to your alternative for my replying to your last letter, or closing the discussion which Universalists began, you have now made it evident to all that you object not, as suggested in your letter of May, through the fear of my introducing new arguments in the closing address: for I have given you my pledge that nothing of the kind on my part was intended, or should be attempted. As our readers cannot now doubt the true reason, I need not infer it for them. Yet you have the courage to say, that my objecting to your alternative for the usual mode of closing all discussions, is to you a "*clear proof* of my unwillingness to meet you on fair and equal grounds"! What singular vision is that, to which twilight or darkness is brighter than day!

2. I will not spend time in replying to your constant imputations of timidity or unfairness, or some sinister influence, as controlling or giving direction to all my movements in reference to the vauntings, challengings, or "modest requests" of Universalists. In all this, you walk in the steps of the leaders of Romanism in this country; for, time after time, did they boastingly say that the reason why I had for years paid no attention to them, was the full assurance I felt that their fortress was unassailable, and that I knew too well what strength they could bring into the field, to think of hazarding a conflict on their grand peculiarities. But, sir, the sequel has convinced them that rather the want of sufficient interest in their cause in this community till recently, and the want of a respectable advocate, was the secret of all my cowardice and timidity.

3. There is another point in which I am sorry to see, or even to imagine that I see, a very striking analogy between your periodical and those of the Roman Catholics. Just about the time that I had a challenge from Bishop Purcell their prints began to create prejudices against me, so that I might not have with the Romanists an impartial hearing. The most singular, misshapen, and unjust views of my sentiments were held up for weeks to that community, so that I might appear under the greatest disadvantage in opposing the swaggering pretensions of the Man of Sin—the real "Sea Serpent" that has been around our coasts for some years.

Digitized by Google

4. The following notice from a gentleman in New York illustrates my meaning, and gives an item or two by way of proof:—"Have you ever seen Mr. Montgomery's letter to the Universalist preacher with whom you had a short discussion at Lockport last June? It was published in Mr. Skinner's paper of March 10th, 1837, just on the eve of your correspondence with him, and was, without doubt, designed for effect. Mr. Potter of Lockport, in his reply to Mr. Montgomery, accuses you of having 'lost sight of not only the Christian character, but of the gentleman;' of having given, at the time of that debate, 'evidence of entire *recklessness to all decency, religion, and* TRUTH.' In the same paper of February 24th, 1837, you are accused by Mr. Grosh, one of the editors of the 'Advocate,' of having 'sinned against dignity and decency' in your notice of Mr. Potter and his congregation, and of having '*violated truth* for the sake of making himself [yourself] appear greater than he [you] really is' [are.] I have no doubt but these pieces were published in the 'Advocate' in order to destroy your reputation with the readers of that paper, and thus get an advantage over you in your intended discussion with Mr. Skinner. If not, why did they make their appearance in its columns at that period?"

5. In answer to my friend and correspondent, I must say, I did not read those pieces to which he alludes: but had I read them, I should not at such a crisis have honored them with a reply. Yourself and brethren, sir, seem to have very great confidence either in your theory, your learning, or your talents, when you imagine that so many appalling and terrific attributes belong to your defence of Universalism. If I thought I could dispossess you or your readers of these hideous spectres that guard the avenues to your fortress, by simply telling the truth, I would, sir, from the inmost recesses of my soul assure you, that, according to my modes of thinking, your cause is incomparably the weakest cause in Christendom; and therefore I promise myself no honor in this earthly world from the most ample refutation of each and every of its pretensions. Its growing popularity and its able defendent which I have found in you, sir, with the frequent challenges I have had to discuss its merits, are my apology to this age for the attention which I am now to bestow upon it. Its growing popularity and the talents of some of its champions, are, indeed, regarded by many as no weak proof of its claims for Divine authority. But, sir, may not infidelity itself rear its hideous front and vauntingly urge the same plea in its defence? I expect then, sir, from you better logic than this.

6. To put an end to all this manœuvring and cavilling about preliminaries, I have concluded to give you every thing you demand:—

1st. You asked a written rather than an oral discussion. I have conceded it.

2d. You have written out and propounded four propositions, and asked me to accept them in preference to any other questions, words, or sentences by me propounded. I have acceded to them.

3d. You proposed to open the discussion on your part by writing on the subject as propounded by Mr. Montgomery. I made no objection. And allow me emphatically to say, had you in your first letter, as I had every reason to expect, offered the propositions, rules, &c. which, before a debate commences are as universal as debating schools from the village Lyceum up to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, you

Digitized by Google

might have saved both the patience of our readers and so many words about nothing. Your last effort to place it all to the credit of your boldness and promptness in the faith, will occasion more smiles than convictions among the discerning.

4th. You have asked twenty letters, of six pages each, to deliver yourself on the subject. You have got them, counting from yours of February 10th to the close. Any excess of pages which you now have will be regulated in the present number according to the computation of my compositor. Having then, sir, nothing more about which to complain, I trust you will henceforth devote all your strength to the question under discussion, according to the preceding stipulations.

7. Your four propositions being now legitimately before us, it is in order for me to make a few farther remarks on their illogical, clumsy, and unworkman-like organization and arrangement. This is not so much the fault of my opponent, perhaps, as the hard destiny of his subject. Indeed it is proof of the difficulties that surround him. The barrenness of the genius of Universalism is more apparent in the hands of one of its master-spirits, than when preached by the humblest of its advocates: for in the latter case we excuse the subject and blame the advocate; while in the former we excuse the advocate and blame the subject. In the present case we blame the soil rather than the cultivator.

8. Give me leave then, sir, to say, your propositions are most singularly illogical and unfortunate: for if there be any point in any one of them, the other three are redundant—yes, sir, as useless as three additional pens would be at this moment in my fingers; or as three new tongues in your mouth when you arise to preach universal heaven. Suppose, for example, I affirm and prove the first proposition as you have written it, that *sheol, hades*, or *gehenna* is used in scripture to express a state of "endless misery;" what comes of Universalism! Can the other three propositions raise it from the dead!!

9. Again, if *olem*, *aion*, and *aionios*, &c. "when applied to the punishment of the wicked do mean duration without end," of what use is the first proposition? Does not this embrace the whole question!! Why prove the same thing a second time under different terms! Your second proposition admits that *olem*, *aion*, and *aionios*, although not applied to *sheol, hades*, and *gehenna*, are nevertheless applied to the punishment of the wicked; therefore you admit there are other words, besides these *three*, indicative of that punishment. *Why did you not, then, put these words in the first proposition along with the aforesaid three?*

10. And here it comes in my way to reply to the last paragraph of your letter now in review. In all that you say of the 2d proposition, you evince how much you felt the dilemma in which you placed yourself in the terms you have chosen. But, sir, you possess the happy art of dispelling sorrow by a smile. You represent me as imploring you for help to disprove your second proposition, while I am exposing its singular concession—that *neither the nature nor duration of the punishment of the wicked is affected in the least by the decision of the first proposition.* That it makes void your first proposition by the supposition which it avows—viz. *that the punishment of the wicked is set forth under other terms than sheol, hades, or gehenna.* Of course, then, nothing depends upon the truth of your first negation!—any more than to deny that fainting,

Digitized by Google

swooning, dying means eternal death, proves that no other words in human language can represent that idea. You will not, my dear sir, hazard the imputation of obtuseness of intellect by either doubting or denying this. This being admitted, converts your smile into a laugh, and disposes of every word in your last epistle on the second proposition. My request for you to enumerate those other words declarative of the punishment of the wicked, which some would call rather *quizzing* you, was indeed intended to make you feel how you had committed yourself, and not to compel you to dishonor your intellectual standing with the whole community by representing me as imploring your assistance to prove my side of the question. I do not think that my opponent ought to set so great a value upon his theory as to stupify himself, and spit upon his beard, feigning himself obtuse, for the sake of escaping from the unfortunate predicament of proposing for discussion two propositions that stultify each other. Truly, his average value of the intellect of his readers is not exaggerated, when he furnishes them with such literary repasts.

11. His 3d proposition is still more radically illogical and redundant: for if "*there are words, or at least one word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked,*" if that word be also not applied to the future happiness of the righteous—neither applied to the one nor the other—of what use is such a proposition in this discussion! But when he produces said word and proves it (which, we think, he cannot do,) we shall more fully show its irrelevancy.

12. The fourth proposition stultifies the three first; for if he prove that "*eternal life will be according to the scriptures the ultimate destiny of all mankind,*" of what use to disprove the two first!—of what use to prove the third? Mr. Skinner's logic reminds me of a certain mystic theologian. His method after reading his text, usually was—"Brethren, my method shall be, 1st. To explain to you what my text does not mean—and in the second place I shall endeavor to show you what it does mean. In the first place, then, it does not literally mean ——. In the second place, it does not metaphorically mean ——. In the third place, it does not analogically mean ——. But in the fourth place, it does literally mean ——," &c. A sagacious wag once interrupted his mystic reverence by observing—"Sir, the weather is cold, the day is short, and the congregation is thin; please, then, explain to us who are present what the text does truly mean, and reserve its negative meanings for those who are absent, or for more favorable circumstances." So I would say to the champion of Universalism—My dear sir, prove that all men are to be eternally happy; reserve what you have to say on the other three propositions to those to whom you fail to prove the fourth, or for the amusement of other readers than mine.

13. Say not, sir, that I have compelled or caused you to take this course. The propositions are your own manufacture, raw material and all. [See again my first letter to you, M. H. p. 178.] I there showed how many points might be made, and left you to select or not, as you pleased. You made no selection, but offered such propositions and in what terms you pleased. You have then, sir, the unrivalled honor of their organization and arrangement.

14. I do not, however, complain of the four propositions as being

Digitized by Google

partial or more favorable to you than to me. They are, indeed, too favorable to me; because, should I fail to sustain my affirmatives, I have lost nothing as respects the claims of Universalism. Should you also clearly sustain your third proposition, still I lose nothing; because, should you blot *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, *sheol*, *hades*, and *gehenna* out of the Bible, and show that there are ten words in Greek or Hebrew that signify duration without end, which are never applied to saint or sinner, I have remaining other words and phrases from which I deduce invincible arguments in proof that it shall not hereafter be with the wicked as with the righteous; that to him who dies in his sins, posthumous, purgatorial, or future holiness and future happiness are as impossible as it is for God to lie. But your liberality is not yet all told: You have so arranged matters, that should I prove any one of the affirmative propositions you have tendered me, it is impossible for you by the other three to make out your theory. I complain, then, because you will have us travel forty years in the wilderness on a journey which might have been performed in a few days, and not of any partiality to yourself in this arrangement. You are, sir, generous to a fault; and it is because I ask no favors, that I revolt at such uncalled-for bounty and munificence at your hand.

15. I disposed of the first proposition in my last, even to your entire satisfaction. The only thing that you do seem dissatisfied with is, the full satisfaction I have given you on that point. I threw your proposition into my crucible; and when its alloy was purged you could not but be pleased with it. But even then you rather blamed me for disentangling your net-work. Or is it possible that you misconceived my object! It would seem so: for you speak of me as having "surrendered an inaccessible and invulnerable fastness"—"the strongest hold"—"I have driven the nail through and clinched it on the other side." And after much to the same effect, you could contain no longer, but burst forth into the following sublime apostrophic personification, or rather rhapsody:—"Hear it, O ye Heavens! Listen, O Earth! Let the world take knowledge of it, let it be recorded in a book and never forgotten! The Reverend Alexander Campbell states in a set controversy with the Rev. Mr. Skinner, a Universalist, that the Hebrew *Shemim*, the Greek *Ouranos*, and the Persian *Paradeisos*, if fairly rendered, cannot of themselves, or without an adjunct, express endless happiness; and that we can no where find *olem*, *aion*, or *aionios* (his favorite term for expressing endless) applied to *Shemim*, *Ouranos*, or *Paradeisos*—in English, heaven and paradise; and therefore he has conceded there is no endless happiness, no eternal life for human kind!!!" I ask you, sir, as an honest man, after reading this version or parody, or what you please to call it, of your aforesaid rhapsody, to say whether so far as this proposition is concerned, if the controversy were about the endless happiness of the saints, my version or imitation, &c. would not be to a scruple as exactly in point as what you have written. I expect no less from you than to say, that the Hebrew *Shemim*, translated sometimes *air*, sometimes *heaven;* and the Greek *Ouranos* and the Latin *Cœlum*, frequently translated the *sensible air*, the *visible sky*, and only sometimes a *state of bliss*, and not necessarily alone, and without an adjunct, *endless bliss*, are exactly standing as *hades*, *sheol*, and *gehenna* in the proposition; and if the question were about endless happiness as

Digitized by Google

it is about endless punishment, my concession, as you call it, would in the one case prove as much against the endless happiness of the righteous as the endless punishment of the wicked. So much, sir, for what you have gained by the first proposition.

16. I will now show what the truth gains from it. First, an explicit renunciation of that grand dogma of Universalism, which is expressed in the words following, to wit:—

"In the sincere penitence and reformation of the offender, justice is satisfied and can neither ask nor receive farther punishment, either retrospective or prospective. The sinner has been punished according to the full demerit of the crime (in his case at least,) and all good objects that could be obtained by punishment are already attained. Thus justice and mercy meet together, righteousness and peace embrace each other," &c.

17. Now as *sheol*, *hades*, and *gehenna* do sometimes represent the punishment of the wicked, and never repentance nor reformation, the above allegation that repentance is the only hell or state of punishment, is fully discarded. Though I do not feel rhapsodic nor elated on obtaining this distinct renunciation of a doctrine so uncomplimentary to Christianity, which presents the Messiah's appearance and mediation a mere pageant, a splendid effort for nothing, still I am pleased that my friend Skinner admits that the wicked are punished in hades, sheol, and gehenna, extra the aforesaid popular dogma.

18. A second point is gained: these words sometimes signifying the punishment of the wicked, it obliges us always to ascertain the nature and extent of that punishment from the words and phrases in connexion with them. Thus the adjuncts of Gehenna make it probable that it was used by our Lord to represent not only punishment for sin, but *future punishment—punishment after death;* and perhaps we might go farther and say, that, with him, it meant sometimes *by its adjuncts* not only future, but *everlasting punishment!!* But then you, sir, will say, or rather have said with the learned Mr. Balfour, or with Mr. Ballou, "How will you account for the fact that Christ never preached gehenna fire, or punishment to any but the Jews?" A learned question, truly! Did Christ ever preach eternal life to the Gentiles!! What sage reflections do we sometimes meet with amongst the old sages of this age! Jesus had no commission but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But we shall hereafter see what he preached to the Jews and what the Apostles preached to the Gentiles. They never mentioned *Gehenna* once to the Gentiles, Mr. Balfour will say. Nor did they ever mention *Shemim*, nor *Paradise*, nor *Abraham's bosom* in any sermon to the Gentiles on record!! What does all this prove? No more than that they always chose such words as their hearers understood as best suited to their ideas. Hence Peter once uses the Pagan word *Tartarus*, because its meaning was well understood in all the Pagan world.

19. You did not, sir, concede quite enough when you conceded in your letter before me that Gehenna is generally taken figuratively in the New Testament I said always, and I repeat it. Of the twelve times in which it is found, it never means a literal punishment in the literal valley of Hinnom. When you mention an exception it will be time enough to examine it.

20. But that it signifies the punishment of the wicked is conceded,

Digitized by Google

and being generally, you say, used figuratively, it generally denotes a punishment of which the flames of Tophet were but a type. Something worse than repentance, truly! But what, let me ask, are its adjuncts! For this purpose we shall hear every passage in which it is found:—"Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, (to his brother,) shall be in danger of *hell fire*." Matth. v. 22. "It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into *hell*." This occurs twice, Matth. v. 29 & 30. "Fear Him who has power to destroy both soul and body in *hell*." Matth. x. 28. "It is better for thee to ENTER INTO LIFE with one eye, rather than having two eyes, to be cast into *hell fire*." "It is better for thee to *enter into life* halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting fire*." Matth. xviii. 8, 9. "And when the proselyte is made you make him two-fold more the *child of hell* than yourselves." Matth. xxiii. 15. "Serpents! generation of vipers! how can you escape the damnation of *hell?*" Matth. xxiii. 33. "Enter into life, rather than go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched." Mark ix. 43. "Enter halt into life, rather than to be cast into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Mark. ix. 45. "Enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than to be cast into hell fire, where the worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched; for every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." Mark ix. 48, 49. "Fear Him who, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear Him." Luke xii. 5. "The tongue is set on fire of hell." James iii. 6.

21. Now, sir, these are the words of an Asiatic, of a Jew, of Jesus, the great Prophet, the Messiah, the Lawgiver, who is *able* to *save* and to *destroy*. In Eastern costume he spoke. Through comparisons, similes, parables, and the most apposite, striking, and beautiful imagery, he communicated the knowledge of things spiritual, future, eternal, divine. Through the *temple*, a *grain of wheat* deposited in the earth, and *Jonah's deliverance* from the sea, he taught the destruction of his body and its resurrection again. Through the *manna*, the *water of Jacob's well*, he set forth the bread and water of life—the strength and consolations of the gospel. By *life* and *death* he taught salvation and condemnation; through *Paradise* and the *valley of Hinnom* he set forth the joys of heaven and the future punishment of ungodly men. As we explain one we explain all. We bring all these figures into one court, try them before one and the same tribunal, and judge them by the same law. Such are the rules of interpretation agreed on.

22. Can we, then, with all these premises before us, doubt that Gehenna is contrasted with "*life*" and "the kingdom of God?" By every law of language, then, it is a state opposite to that to which it is contrasted. Good and evil, light and darkness, pleasure and pain, sweet and bitter, &c. &c. are contrasts; so is life and death, heaven and hell, *life* and *hell;* so is the kingdom of God and hell. We have in the passages quoted the phrase "*enter into life*" three or four times contrasted with entering into Gehenna. Now I ask, whatever is meant by *entering into life*, the very opposite of that is going into, or being *cast into Gehenna*. If, then, to "enter into life," as all Christendom admits, is to

Digitized by Google

enter into future and eternal bliss, to be cast into hell is to be cast into eternal punishment, or into everlasting death.

23. But we have not only to consider its *adjuncts* by way of contrast, but by way of substitution. Thus, in Matth. xviii. 8 & 9. *gehenna* is substituted for *to pur to aionion*, THE EVERLASTING FIRE. To be cast into hell, and into the *aionion pur*, the everlasting fire, are, in the style of Jesus, identical expressions, perfect equipolents. But this is not a solitary expression, though then it were not to be explained away. It is the settled style of the Messiah. Thus, to *go into hell*, and to *go into the fire that shall never be quenched*, are also identical; for in Mark ix. we have this phrase repeated *three times*. Gehenna, then, as explained by its adjuncts, means, "fire, everlasting fire, fire that shall not be quenched;" and this everlasting and unquenchable fire is by contrast explained to be the opposite of entering into life, the kingdom of God, or eternal happiness. So, then, to say nothing of destroying soul and body in hell, after the body is killed, which is so plain that even the ingenious Mr. Skinner can find no way of evading it, except by asking, Who is *he* that *is able to destroy*—it is obvious Jesus threatened by Gehenna an everlasting punishment to his enemies, who should be salted with fire as sacrifices were preserved by salt.

24. Thus the punishment or damnation of hell was always preached by Jesus as future punishment, punishment after death; a punishment contrasted with life, with the kingdom of God, expressed by the strongest imagery, not merely by fire, but by *aionion* or "everlasting fire," "a fire that shall never be quenched."

25. It will avail little for you, my friend Mr. Skinner, to take the ground of Mr. Balfour, and tell what the fire and worms of Hinnom anciently meant, or the salt of the sacrifices; and then assume that the destruction of the Jews at Jerusalem was meant, &c.; for we will then show it matters not what the manna, the rock of Horeb, the brazen serpent, the temple, Jerusalem, Mount Zion, Paradise, the valley of Hinnom, the undying worm, and a thousand other things, originally meant. That is one question; but what they became figures of, or what they in process of time came to denote, is quite another question. The New Testament manna, passover, circumcision, temple, Jerusalem, Mount Zion, Paradise, Gehenna, and the worm that dieth not, you will never be able to show are the same as the Old Testament or first things represented by these words. Why, then, make a special law in favor of Gehenna, the word in debate!!!

26. The assumption that the destruction of Jerusalem and all your &c's thereunto appended, constitute the gehenna or hell threatened by Jesus, scarcely deserves grave consideration. Then Jesus said in vain to his blaspheming contemporaries, "Serpents! offspring of vipers! how can you escape [the punishment] the damnation of hell!" By dying and being buried long before that day, they escaped the damnation of hell in the heaven of Universalism!

27. To prevent the recurrence of a new species of logic, I select a sample or two from the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th paragraphs of your June letter:—

"The Hebrew *sheol*," you say, "and Greek *hades*, more properly signifies [signify] a state or condition than a place. It signifies [they signify] *first* literally and commonly the state or condition (or if you please the place) of the dead in general, irrespective of their goodness or bad-

Digitized by Google

ness, their happiness or misery." So far I have already asserted. Here, then, there is no need of proof, for we agree. But you add, "*Secondly*, in a figurative sense, severe judgments, great afflictions, sudden temporal destruction. *Thirdly*, in a *moral* and figurative sense—a distressing sense of guilt, remorse of conscience, great mental anguish." Then, without a single instance by way of proof or illustration, you proceed to prove your definition by the case in debate. This is summary justice—the Lynch-law of Theology. For example, you despatch Psalm ix. 17. and my other witnesses by assuming, without a single proof, "that in the second or third of the foregoing senses, or *perhaps* (yes, PERHAPS BOTH) does David use the word hell," &c. Ps. ix. 17. 'The wicked shall be turned into a distressing sense of guilt, or *perhaps* into remorse of conscience, and all the nations that forget God'!!! A flaming abolitionist in Vicksburg could as easily escape the vigilance of Judge Lynch, as your humble servant from such a judgment seat as you have erected, and such witnesses as you have brought into court in this and many similar cases, both in your first and last letters to me.

28. "The case of *Tartarus* is a suppositious one!" "to illustrate an argument!" "most likely to refer to some heathen tradition," "some apocryphal book," "some fable or story" about angels and Tartarus!! This is summary work of the same category.

29. "Universalism is co-eval with the days of Christianity"!!! I thought it was more ancient. There is a fable that says, the Old Serpent was a graduate in that school; for his first sermon was from the text, "You shall not surely die," or, You will be eternally happy!

30. You will accept these as a mere specimen of the easy disposition of much that you have written, which, for the want of room, and because not pertinent to the question, I suffer in the meantime to pass toll-free.

31. I am now prepared to examine the second proposition, if you can only explain it, or show that it does not stultify the first. That *olem*, *aion*, and *aionios* do sometimes mean endless duration I do affirm, and you dare not deny; and that as we ascertain from the adjuncts that Gehenna in the lips of Jesus represents punishment after death, future and eternal destruction from the presence of the Lord, so it may *perhaps* be made as evident that these epithets prefixed to those words which you are yet to reveal, may, by their adjuncts, as clearly indicate duration without end, as we have proved *by an induction in every case* in which Gehenna is found, that *it most certainly represents eternal death, if there be any eternal life into which the* ONE-EYED *hearers of Jesus entered*, through faith in him and obedience to his will.

31. From the calculation of my compositor we are now equal in point of space. I have numbered the paragraphs for the sake of easy and certain reference, and will henceforth number our forty letters, commencing with yours of February 10th as No. I. I have signed the stipulations and prefixed them to your June letter. You will please present them to your readers with both our signatures attached to them. The yet unanswered parts of Letter No. I. will come in review under their proper heads.——Very benevolently and respectfully,

A. CAMPBELL.

P. S. We waited almost a month for the reply to our last; and unless the utmost despatch is observed by the parties, the discussion must be on hand a long time. This leaves Bethany by the mail of July 6, it being the first proof we could in the present circumstances obtain. A. C.

Digitized by Google

PROPOSED REFORMATION AMONG THE BAPTISTS.

It is with unfeigned pleasure that we observe, both East and West, numerous indications of the spirit of reform pervading, or about to pervade, the Baptist denomination. These indications are the more pleasing, inasmuch as they seem to be of a healthy cast. They contemplate not a change of theory, but a change of practice. We bid them God speed with all our heart, while they aim at bringing the churches up to the New Testament standard of piety and morality.

The following Manifesto of the need of reform, is copied out of *The Cross and Baptist Journal* of June 30. A Baptist writer, with permission of the conductors of the paper, on the *sin of covetousness*, or rather, on "*covetousness, the sin of the Baptist denomination*," among many other judicious remarks, thus speaks—

"I come now to furnish some proofs of the existence of the sin of covetousness to a very sad extent in the Baptist denomination. And who apprehends for me a difficult task? I wish it was difficult. O! I would that such a charge upon the Baptist denomination could not be sustained! As it is, I must join all whose views accord with mine, in taking up a lamentation and bewailing our sad condition. See how it looks in plain language. The Baptists, as a people, are covetous, very covetous. Covetousness is a sin which Baptists indulge in largely as a body. Covetousness is a sin which they suffer upon another unrebuked. Yes, whilst we flatter ourselves that we hold to the truth in its purity, and every jot and tittle of sound doctrine, together with all the Ps and Qs of strict gospel order, this prolific sin is nourished unconsciously in our bosoms, a concealed canker-worm which is gnawing our vitals continually, and threatens our extermination as a religious people.

"There is proof of this, both inferential and positive. Spiritual declension in individuals or churches is inferential proof of the existence of this sin. The love of many waxing cold is proof that this kind of iniquity abounds. Here is a scriptural and very comprehensive definition of spiritual declension in general. Love waxing cold. Because *love* is a New Testament term, big with meaning. Love is the fulfilling of all gospel law: love is the very essence of religion: love is the bond of Christian union; the germ of Christian growth; the substance of Christian excellence; the only distinguishing quality of God's people on earth; and the only visible evidence of genuine Christianity. Is not the want of love—the want of spirituality—the want of primitive

Digitized by Google

Christian zeal—the want of brotherly kindness and charity, a general complaint among us? O yes; and the scriptures make it no difficult matter in such cases to determine the cause. Sin lieth at the door. "He that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger." Job xvii. 9. By a parity of reasoning, the hands that are defiled with covetousness shall be weaker and weaker. "The liberal soul shall be made fat." Provbs. xi. 25. But the paralyzing effects of covetousness will be proved by the complaint—"My leanness, my leanness: wo unto me." Isa. xxiv. 16.

"Many churches are "ready to die;" and many only "have a a name to live, whilst they are dead." Yes, dead! Dead to all efficient sense of the nature and extent of Christian obligatton—dead as to any appreciable influence in favor of vital piety—dead to all the incentives and encouragements to enlarged Christian effort, plodding along in a comfortless way where are no spiritual delights, nor any foretastes of joys to come; but many tokens of God's displeasure. This is but the legitimate effects of causes adequate to produce them. Such facts are abundant proof of a habitually disobedient people; a sin defiled company bearing the Christian name. And if such an exterior evidences the hidden corrodings of one sin more than another, it is covetousness. It will be found often that worldly policy has warped even the form of godliness. Once or twice a-month is as often as any Sabbath sanctity can be allowed of, and then a peculiar relish is manifested for such services as require no sacrifices, and such perverted doctrines as favor the indulgence of this right-hand sin, covetousness. Must it not be inferred that that covetousness is the besetting sin of churches of this cast, where there are no works of faith nor labors of love to prove the contrary? Whoever opens the Bible and reads the clear delineations of Christian character, and the examples of self-sacrificing zeal there exhibited, will find such an inference warrantable.

"There is one fact more with respect to this denominational sin, which should not be overlooked by one who would do justice to the subject. It is respecting its extent. It extends even to the ministry. A large number of Baptist ministers are more greedy of filthy lucre than they are of winning souls to Christ. In proof of this, how few are they who are willing to risk all they have, and throw themselves upon the Lord and his people, while they preach with faithfulness and constancy the whole truth in its fulness and purity. It seems to me that this is what is required of Christ's ministers, even if they have to go like Latimer, barefooted. The present state of things among us require that a host of this stamp should be raised up to set things right."

The following resolutions passed the Baptist General Association of Virginia, at their late meeting in Richmond, June 3d:—

Digitized by Google

"Whereas it is to be apprehended that the low state of religion in Virginia is to be attributed to some extent to the practice of spending a large portion of the Lord's day in travelling and visiting, in worldly conversation, especially in the worldly spirit which too generally prevails—Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That all our churches be earnestly recommended to meet every Lord's day for the worship of God, and to seek a greater conformity to the spirit and word of Jesus Christ.

"*Resolved*, That it be recommended to all our brethren, to observe the 4th day of July as a day of public worship.

"*Resolved*, That in view of the general state of coldness that pervades our churches, throughout Virginia, this Association believes that the alarming aspect of the times as respects the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, calls for deep humiliation before God, humble confession of our sins, and corresponding effort to awake to our obligations.

"*Resolved*, That it be affectionately recommended to our churches throughout the state to observe the last Saturday in July as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer to God, for the purpose of making confession of our sins, and imploring his mercy."

The KENTUCKY BAPTIST CONVENTION held at Georgetown, June 3d, was composed of only "sixteen delegates (including six ladies) from Scott county, and ten from other parts of the state"! Our friend the Editor of the *Baptist Banner*, uses the following language as descriptive of the present state of the denomination in Kentucky:—

"We have in the state upwards of 500 churches, with but little over 200 ministers, and an aggregate of at least 40,000 members. We know of but seven churches that have preaching every Lord's day. A large majority of churches have preaching but once a-month. Even these 200 ministers, owing to the culpable neglect of their churches in most instances, do not give themselves wholly to the work. Most of them are poor men and have families to support. Hence they have to toil all the week in their fields or in their shops, and on Lord's day preach to churches that would suffer them to die in want, and their families be reduced to beggary, rather than give them of their "carnal things." This state of affairs can and ought to be speedily remedied. The whole time of every laborer is needed in the harvest of the Lord. It is in vain that we pray the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into the harvest, when with our own hands we manacle those who would go, and who are longing to enter the field. We have no doubt that it was because we were unworthy of them, that so many of our preachers have fallen asleep in Jesus. Others

Digitized by Google

have been compelled by penury to seek homes in other states farther west. Of those now amongst us, many of their heads are blossoming for the grave. A few more years and they must go the way of all the earth. Who are to succeed them? Look around, and how few are they that will stand in their pulpits, when the places that know them now shall know them no more forever! And after treating as we have those servants whom the Lord has hitherto sent us, what reasonable expectations can we entertain that he will ever send us others!"

It is not long since it would have been counted railing or reviling on our part to have urged these delinquencies in proof of the need of reformation. It gives us no pleasure to republish such an exposition of degeneracy in any portion of professing Christians; but real pleasure to see that the errors are perceived and confessed, and means of reformation proposed. But whether the means are adequate to the disease and promise a remedy, is a question of immense importance

The Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist communities have for some twenty-five years past grown very fast. They have enjoyed what the great mass of society calls great prosperity. But highly superficial must be his knowledge of church history, who does not know that the most rapid growth and outward prosperity of a religious society is no evidence of purity, piety, or moral soundness. Nay, on the contrary, it often happens that the purity and the piety of a denomination decline in the exact ratio of its increase in favor with the people and in the number of its proselytes. Perhaps this is a law of society, rather than an accident in the present constitution of things. Undeniably, however, it is a fact hitherto, that those communities that have most flourished have been most corrupt. Let all the societies into which Christendom is at present divided be tested by the Book, and we opine there will be found no exception to this law. Beginning with the Roman and Greek churches, those will be found most corrupt who have the most wealth, the most colleges, the most splendid temples, cathedrals, synagogues, and altars, and the most learned, eloquent, and powerful public advocates. If true of individuals, how true of churches—how hardly shall they who have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven! Yet wealth, and colleges, and meeting-houses, and learning, and eloquence,

Digitized by Google

and popularity are all good, desirable, and useful, when not abused. But it is almost as impossible for Christians not to abuse these, as it is for children to sport with flint and steel and fire-arms in a magazine of powder, without detriment to themselves or others.

What is now rending the Presbyterian society but its great endowments of learning, eloquence, wealth, and popularity! and what the cause of the begun decline of Methodism, or of the worldly temper, covetousness, and general carnality of the Baptist denomination? Like the Laodicean church, they are all become rich and learned, and have need of nothing; but, unlike that church, they are all zealous for proselyting, however lukewarm in their devotion to the Christianity of the New Testament.

In one word, nothing will benefit any of these societies—I mean truly, permanently, and religiously benefit them, but an abandonment of all humanisms and a cordial return to the original institution of Jesus Christ, as found in the New Testament; and a more practical display of all the Christian graces—more humility, spirituality, prayerfulness—more personal and family piety—more abstraction from the pursuits of worldly wealth and worldly honor: in one word, they must live more to God and less to themselves—more to eternity and less to time—more to heaven and less to earth than they now do, or than they have ever done.

Family religious education, and indeed family religion, are to my certain knowledge, and I believe have long been, most shamefully neglected amongst the Baptists. When the Cross & Baptist Journal has done justice to the sin of covetousness, I hope that the sin of family neglect, as respects moral culture and religious worship, will be laid open with equal faithfulness and affection.

The chances of a pious offspring and of salvation are, in my opinion and as far as my knowledge extends, much greater in a Presbyterian than in either a Baptist or Methodist family. And yet the modern Presbyterian is much degenerated from the good old strict Presbyterians of 1648; and they of that day wanted a good deal of that wisdom, knowledge, and zeal which the law and the gospel communicate on the subject of family doctrine, discipline, and worship.

Digitized by Google

Let our brethren, who call themselves reformers, be alarmed, and on their guard against this worldly temper, this carnal policy, which will as certainly blight and mildew their prospective harvest as it is now doing, and has always done, in those societies that neglect to seek for themselves and their children first of all the kingdom of God and his eternal righteousness.

A. C.

From the Cross and Baptist Journal.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

This body met in Philadelphia on the 18th of May. The old school candidate, Rev. David Elliot, D. D., professor in the theoligical seminary at Pittsburg, was chosen moderator; he received 137 votes, Reverend Baxter Dickinson, Professor in Lane Seminary, received 106 votes. Old school majority, 31. Rev. John M. Krebs, of New York, was chosen permanent clerk. The principal business of the Assembly, as far as we have seen its proceedings, has been to carry out the reform proposed by the Convention.

The memorial of the Convention was presented to the Assembly, and referred to a committee. On Monday, 22d, the committee made a partial report, which proposed the following resolutions, viz.—

1. That between these two branches* of the church of Christ in our country, there should always exist a mutual respect and esteem, and that no reasonable efforts should be omitted to keep a good understanding.

2. That it is expedient to continue the friendly intercourse which is now kept up between this church and the Congregational churches of New England.

3. But as the plan of union, formed in 1801, for uniting Congregationalists and Presbyterians in the same churches in the new settlements, was originally unconstitutional on the part of the General Assembly, having never been submitted to the presbyteries or ratified by them, and as the General Assembly of Connecticut had no authority on its part to make such a compact to bind even the churches of that state, and still less to bind those out of its own bounds, and as the plan is found to be in its operation unnatural and injurious, it is hereby declared to be abrogated.

After some discussion, the resolutions were adopted, and thus one step in the proposed reform is effected by abrogating the *plan of union* formed 36 years ago between the Congregational and Presbyterian churches.

On Wednesday, 24th, the committee on the memorial reported further, recommending the following resolutions:—

Resolved, 1. That the proper steps be now taken to cite to the bar of the next Assembly, such inferior judicatories as are charged by Common Fame with irregularities.

2. That a special committee be now appointed to ascertain what inferior judicatories are thus charged by Common Fame, prepare charges and specifications against them, and to digest a suitable plan of procedure in the matter, and that said committee be requested to report as soon as practicable.

* *Congregational and Presbyterian.*

Digitized by Google

3. That, as citations on the foregoing plan is the commencement of a process involving the right of membership in the Assembly; therefore, resolved, That agreeably to a principle laid down, chapter five, section nine, of the 'Form of Government,' the members of said judicatories be excluded from a seat in the next Assembly until their case shall be decided;

Which, after long and earnest debate, were adopted on the following day. Yeas, 128—Nays, 122. Another step in the process of reform.

On Saturday, 27th, Mr. Breckenridge presented a motion, which, after considerable amendment, was in substance as follows:—That a committee of ten be appointed, to consist of an equal number from the majority and minority on the last vote, to consider and report a plan for the voluntary and amicable division of the Presbyterian church! It was carried, and the following committee appointed, viz —R. J. Breckenridge; A. Alexander, D. D.; C. C. Kuyler, D. D.; J. Witherspoon, D. D.; N. Ewing; Absalom Peters, D. D.; N. S. S. Beman, D. D.; B. Dickinson, W. Jesup, and T. M'Auley, D. D.

The committee was directed to meet at the close of the morning session of the Assembly, and afterwards on their own adjournment.

On Tuesday, May 30th, (according to the New York Evangelist,) Dr. Alexander, from the Committee of Ten, reported that they had not been able to agree on any plan. Each party in the committee would therefore present a separate report. The separate reports were then read, from which I gather, that the old school committee determined at the outset to have the negociation carried on exclusively in writing, and the two sections met in separate rooms, and transmitted their *protocols*, propositions, objections, answers, &c. from one to another in the style of the Treaty at Ghent. No one could expect a Christian result from such a carnal mode of procedure. They, however, agreed on several points: that it was desirable that the church should divide, without specifying any reasons; one party to be called the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and the other the American Presbyterian Church; that the particular funds should be retained for the objects to which they were appropriated, the Board and Seminaries to go with the old name, and the disposable funds equally divided. The question on which they split was, whether the division should be made by this General Assembly, on its own responsibility, or whether the question should be sent down to the presbyteries, the members of the committee pledging themselves to use their influence in good faith to induce all the presbyteries to accede to the proposal. The new school members declared that they could not conscientiously assume the responsibility of consummating a division by the General Assembly, without the action of the Presbyteries, because they believed such a course to be unconstitutional.

The committee was discharged, and the report respecting the amicable division laid on the table.

On the same day, the following resolution was offered by Mr. Plummer, viz.—

Resolved, That by the operation of the vote of abrogation of the plan of union of 1801, the Synod of the Western Reserve is, and is hereby declared to be no longer a part of the Presbyterian Church.

In the course of the debates in the Assembly, Professor Dickinson of Lane Seminary, in relation to the 'errors in doctrine,' which are charged upon the new school party, said—

'I do not hold one of these errors: others have been misunderstood; had they been understood, I have the charity to believe that prosecution would not have been commenced. I affirm most positively that the action

Digitized by Google

of the majority of this assembly in their premises, is aimed at many who do not hold these errors. In adopting the report of the committee you move in the dark. I wished to disown these errors in the mass and in the detail: those associated with me desire to do so, and as frankly; but we have wanted opportunity. If those against whom this list of errors is levelled, were allowed to testify honestly in relation to them, it would immediately be found that there in reality existed no occasion for process. Justice to myself, to the Presbytery of which I am a member, to the Theological Seminary in which I am a Professor, demand this open and entire disavowal of them. I adopt the Calvinistic system sincerely. I go not for any other system of doctrine or government.'

In reference to the resolutions citing to the bar of the next Assembliy the judicatories charged by Common Fame with irregularities, and in the mean time excluding their delegates from a seat, Dr. Beman, of Troy, New York, said—

'These resolutions which it is asked we should adopt, are summary Lynch law. 2. My second proposition relates to the operation of these resolutions in excluding commissioners from seats in the Assembly. * * * You might as well shoot a ball at the rock of Gibraltar, as to attempt to deprive a commissioner of a seat in the next Assembly, who comes with a regular commission. The Constitution gives them a seat; the committee of commissions dare not control their right; they must report them. It is not the Moderator of the Assembly, nor the Convention which has concocted this measure, that can keep them out. We plant ourselves on the solid rock of the Constitution of our church; we cling to that rock; if we go down, the whole Presbyterian system must go down with us. The men whom you are going to cut off are men of Thermopylæ—Smithfield men; they may burn, but it will be with the Constitution of our church in our hands and near our hearts. The men of the Convention who are ripe for revolution, may take the warning, that if they get this resolution passed, one year will render its advocates odious. A thousand trumpet blasts will carry the news rapidly over this country. Fifty members of this Assembly are now absent. Next year, at this time, every man will be at his post, with his commission in his pocket. We will meet this question at Philippi: there it will be settled. * * * We have come in on constitutional right. Like our pilgrim predecessors, we will plant ourselves on the rock and look on the dashing waves around us and smile. When in, we don't go out under any legislation which is unconstitutional. We live or die by the constitution. Something more is necessary than the panaceas, pill-boxes, and febrifuge which have been mentioned. We will not submit to be cut off by any such summary process.'

In reference to the same resolutions, Rev. R. J. Breckenridge is reported by a correspondent of the Cincinnati Journal to have said—

R. J. Breckenridge next obtained the floor. He was very open and frank in his declarations. He did not support the resolution upon constitutional grounds. We are in circumstances for which the constitution makes no provision. Our exigencies demand extra constitutional measures. No body provides for its own dissolution. Our laws oppose murder, but not suicide. That it cannot punish or reach. The orthodox must take decisive measures *now*, or they may never have another opportunity. Another year they may be in the minority. He warned the old school party, that if they would not act decidedly when they had the power, that the orthodox would go off and leave the church. He was in favor of cutting off now, constitution or no constitution, and he was not sure but he should make a motion to that effect. The corrupt branches must be cut off, and the quicker the easier and the better. The legal course was too long and too troublesome.

Digitized by Google

O the madness of party! Lynch law openly advocated!

The resolution of Mr. Plummer, cutting off the Synod of the Western Reserve (Ohio,) has been adopted; also, on June 5th, the Synods of Utica, Geneva, and Genesee, (in central and western New York,) including about 400 ministers, and about 40 commissioners to the present Assembly, were cut off in the same summary manner. A resolution has also been passed, designed to prohibit the operations of the American Home Mission Society, and the American Education Society, within the bounds of the Presbyterian church. Thus the old school majority carry on the work of reform.

A paragraph from a correspondent of the Journal and Luminary will show the temper and attitude of the new school side:—

We made an effort, as you have seen from the papers, for an amicable division. The propositions on one side were constitutional and honorable: on the other side, they were revolutionary. The effort was abandoned as hopeless, and they went to the work of division with a vengeance. The first blow cut off the Western Reserve Synod, and the members of those Presbyteries were shut out of the house.

You will want to know what we are doing in the storm, on our side. 1. We are keeping our temper as well as we can. 2. Some of our men are giving them plain and heavy talk. Beman has twice come out with a giant's strength. 3. We are entering as solemn and pithy protests as we can make. 4. We are recording ayes and nays at a great rate. 5. We are preparing manifests to the churches, that all may see how things stand, and what we think they ought in the awful crisis to do. 6. We are holding up the acts of the Assembly as a dismemberment of the church, of course null and void, and claiming for those excluded from the house their right to sit and act. 7. We are giving legal notice to the Trustees of the Assembly, that they are not to pay out any funds the coming year, but on their personal responsibility. In this last measure, we are advised by the best legal counsel. And we are advised that we have only to hold on, and the next year all our Presbyteries send as usual. If we are the majority, we form, and undo all the revolutionary proceedings of this Assembly. If in the minority, and the members from Synods cut off are excluded, they may retire and form, and call themselves the General Assembly, and be maintained in the position.

Our men seem to be firm. I think they will all do their duty; and that the unrighteous and oppressive and mad acts of an infatuated majority will come to naught.

How vain or how insincere the prayers daily offered for the union and communion of Christians, by those who could deliberately vote for the disunion of two branches of what they esteem the church of Christ, after an intercommunion of thirty-six years; and that, too, for reasons of expediency. Perhaps, in all Christendom there are no two communities that are so much one in doctrinal opinions and in general views of Christian obligation and enterprize, as the Congregational and Presbyterian confederates in the General Assembly. If, then, after a thirty-six years' communion, and a very special agreement in faith, matters of religious opinion, and general operations, they must separate and be to each other as any two of the most antipodal parties in all the professing world, what hopes can they have of the near approach of the *millennial era*, for which they pray, and of which

Digitized by Google

they give such fine descriptions! If Christian sympathy and forbearance, and if brotherly kindness and love were found inadequate to hold in union and co-operation those so much alike in all their own grand characteristics of Christian excellence, how can it be expected that these virtues in their present strength could subdue into one holy alliance the more discordant elements of Protestant Christendom! Truly, this event disappoints expectation, sickens hope, and throws us back centuries in arrear of what we fondly dreamed was the redeeming and harmonizing spirit of the age.

I have no leisure nor space for comment on these proceedings. I might, indeed, expatiate on them much to the advantage of our brethren, in corroboration of the views which for so many years we have been promulging. That human creeds and platforms for church union and communion, so far from answering these ends and uses—so far from preserving a pure church and a united people, naturally tend to discord and division, has again been proved for the thousandth and first time. That every attempt to reform the Westminster Creed has made a new party, has been proved nine times already, and it appears that it will be proved the tenth time next year. We shall then have ten sorts of Westminster Divines and Westminster Christians. Should we live to see that day, it may be in season to preach another sermon on the old text. Meanwhile, the preceding summary view from the Cross and Baptist Journal, is both text and comment enough for the present. A. C.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"How to be Saved," a Sermon on Mark xvi. 15, 16. by *J. Shannon*, President of the Louisiana College, Jackson, La.; printed and published in the "*Christian Preacher*" for July, 1837, by D. S. Burnet, Cincinnati.

Starting at the sublimest of all propositions, viz.—that God is love,—the preacher illustrates and enforces the following very important points in the religion and philosophy of the Bible:—

1st. That God, in creating man, had no other object than his happiness—evinced from the fact, that "no faculty has been given to man in his whole organization which is even *capable* of producing misery in its healthy action."

2d. That suffering was "introduced into the human family by man's perverting his powers and disregarding the conditions of his being."

3d. That God requires nothing, prohibits nothing, only with a reference to the happiness of his creatures. Then arises the question, *What mean positive institutions?* Are they, or are they not, compatible with the foregoing principles? Are they in perfect harmony with God's goodness and man's happiness?

4th. The necessity of revelation to human happiness next falls in the way of the preacher; the necessity of a full conviction of its truth in order to a compliance with all its requisitions, and the necessity of such a compliance in order to human happiness, are very convincingly stated.

Digitized by Google

5th. Then comes what I must regard as the cardinal point of this discourse, viz.—That there is a *certain state of mind* as necessary to salvation as revelation itself; and that is that state of mind to which positive institutions are addressed, and to the cultivation and cherishing of which they are admirably adapted. Hence God has laid positive institutions at the very foundation of every system of religious observances given to man.

On positive institutions he observes,—

"*He*, therefore, is unwise, as well as profane, who indirectly charges God with folly, by speaking lightly of such institutions; as though it were comparatively a trivial matter in the business of a sinner's salvation whether or not he observed them with scrupulous regard.

"That this confidence in God, and in his instructions, as teaching infallibly the way to happiness, is essential to the salvation of man, will not, cannot be questioned. Let it, however, be observed very distinctly, that *the abstract confidence itself is of no value.* Its whole value is derived from the course of action to which it prompts. For example: a man is condemned to death by the laws of his country Before his execution he hears that the Governor *can* pardon him, and that he has *promised* to do so, provided he will make the application in a particular way. He believes the testimony, and his faith saves him: but how? Most assuredly not the abstract faith, but the *application* which it prompted him to make. Had he not made the application, he would have been hanged as certainly, *in spite of his faith*, as if he had never heard nor believed the testimony at all.

"In short, all nature unites with revelation in testifying that faith without works is dead, being ALONE. You might select ten thousand examples, and each would prove, that in the whole business of life, as well as of religion, although faith lies at the basis of action, it derives all its value from the action to which it prompts. It is, therefore, in the estimation of sober reason, most manifestly absurd to attach to *faith alone*, and *separately regarded*, that value to which it can only lay claim in consequence of the works that it produces.

"Thus, as we have seen, the soundest philosophy teaches that God desires the salvation of mankind; that sin alone, a course of conduct not in harmony with the unchangeable laws of their organization, has been their undoing;—that, consequently, it is impossible for God himself to save them in any other way than by saving them from sin, by "turning them from disobedience to the wisdom of the just;"—that this conversion, or change from *disobedience* to *obedience*, cannot be effected without faith;—and that hence the importance of the end (obedience) reflects a corresponding value upon faith, the means essential to its accomplishment.

"So clearly demonstrable are these truths, that, were the gospel to offer men salvation on any other terms, it would be evidently *inapplicable to man's condition, incapable of rendering him the necessary relief,—would therefore be* UNWORTHY *of acceptation, and should be unhesitatingly rejected by every rational being.* What, then, becomes of many of the absurd dogmas that Deists, and the advocates of a corrupt form of Christianity, have opposed as huge mountains of objection to this doctrine? One stroke of the hammer of true philosophy beats them to dust, and the breath of sound reason scatters them to the four winds of heaven."

6th. Another very important point, well illustrated and sustained in this discourse, is, that as "the hope of impunity *may* act as a temptation to sin even amongst holy beings," it becomes obvious that God's BENEVOLENCE, no less than his JUSTICE, renders him unable to dispense with the penalty, and thereby foster sin to the ruin of his creatures."

7th. Hence arises another point which ought to be prominent in all minds:—"Penalty never was designed to operate in any other way than to prevent sin by taking away the hope of impunity."

After which he observes—

"This is the only way in which it ever did, ever will, or ever can operate. Whatever, therefore, most effectually takes away the hope of impunity, is, to all intents, the most effectual penalty.

"Here let us behold, with adoring gratitude, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the goodness of God. His whole soul was moved with compassion for his enemies, and with ardent desires for their salvation. But his goodness—(yes, sinner, hear it, his goodness)—*forbade that mercy should be extended to the guilty on such terms as to endanger the happiness of the innocent.* In this fearful emergency God's infinite wisdom devised the marvellous scheme that has been the admiration of angels, from the time it was first promulgated, down to the present moment. The scheme was this—to give, in the person of a VOLUNTARY substitute, such an exhibition of the evil consequences of sin as might take away the hope of impunity, at least *as well* as the punishment of the original transgressor.

"But do the sufferings of God's incarnate Son answer this purpose? Assuredly they do, even better than the actual infliction of the whole penalty on every original transgressor. To be fully convinced of this, we have but to consider his character,—God's only begotten and well-beloved Son, in whom the Father was always well pleased; who had never

Digitized by Google

offended his Father in any thing; who had relinquished even the glories of heaven, and submitted to unparalleled privations and sufferings on earth, to do his Father's will, maintain the honor of his government, and advance his darling objects; in whom no sin ever was found but as he bore our iniquities: and if *such a character, in such circumstances*, had to suffer, and be made an example, it surely would be the very height of madness to expect that God ever will, or ever can, allow sin to go unpunished.

"The foregoing is evidently the view which the Scriptures, as well as reason, every where take of the sufferings of Christ; and particularly Paul, where he speaks of them as a propitiation for sin, to the end that God "might be JUST and the JUSTIFIER of him who believeth in Jesus." To me this seems very obviously to imply, that, but for this intervention, God could not be just and allow the transgressor to escape punishment. You will easily discover that this is precisely the proposition we have already demonstrated. Hence, by the example made on Calvary, in the person of Jesus Christ, every difficulty on God's part is removed out of the way, and his boundless compassion to a world lying in wickedness, gushes forth unrestrained, save by the sinner's own voluntary rejection of the offered mercy. "God is now in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

Then follows the true intent and meaning of Mark xvi. 15, 16, of baptism in the Christian institution, with a dignified, calm, logical, and scriptural refutation of all the popular objections. The tone and temper of this discourse—its firm, yet mild and persuasive style—its kind and good spirit, rare excellencies in this our disputatious age, cannot, in our judgment, fail to prepossess the reader as much in favor of the Christian character of its author, as its logic and evidence demonstrate to him the truth and authority of his doctrine. I wish I could give my readers a miniature view of it; but it is much better for them to have it in its original form, and therefore we refer them to the *Christian Preacher*, which furnishes so many choice repasts for its readers.

"THE GOSPEL VINDICATOR," conducted by a committee in Coburg, Upper Canada; published on the first Monday of every month, and sent to all parts of the Provinces, post paid, for one dollar per annum, payable in advance. All who obtain and pay for five subscribers one month after subscribing, have one copy gratis. No. I. appeared on the 5th of June, containing 16 pages octavo. A few sentences from the Introduction to this work will evince its design:—

"To exhibit the lamentable apostacy from the *ancient gospel and order of things* which now exists in this province, and the religious world generally—to form a bond of *love* and *union* among brethren—to restore *primitive Christianity*, and to disseminate the *truths of the gospel*, is the design of this little work To assist in doing this, we call upon all friends of true religion to aid us with their patronage and their talents.

"In accordance with our motto, Christian liberty will be one of the leading topics in the Vindicator, as genuine religion can breathe freely only in the atmosphere of freedom.

"In the midst of strifes and divisions, and while one says 'I am of Paul,' and another 'I am of Apollos,' let us declare that we are 'of Christ'—that we have enlisted under his banner, and acknowledged him 'King of kings, and Lord of lords'—and that we will have no other Constitution than the one given by Jesus and his Apostles.

"We shall call the attention of our readers to a more strict examination of the Scriptures. 'The Scripture of the Old and New Testament,' says John Wesley, 'is the fountain of heavenly wisdom, which they who taste prefer to all writings of *men*, however wise learned, or holy.' To be profited by reading these narratives, 'the Christian, who sincerely desires to understand them, will not only most unfeignedly present his supplications and prayers to Him who gives his Holy Spirit to them that ask him, but he will exercise those faculties of understanding which God has given him, and to which he has adopted all his communications since man became a transgressor. He will apply the same rules of interpretation to these compositions which he would apply to any other writings of the same antiquity. He will consider the terms, not otherwise explained by the writers, as conveying the same ideas which they are wont to convey in common acceptation. He will always keep the design of the writer before his mind: and for this purpose he will attend to all circumstances requisite to ascertaining his design—such as the character of the writer himself, the circumstance of the people whom he addressed, or amongst whom he published his writings; their peculiar prejudices, views, and feelings at the time of his writing to or for them; his own most explicit avowals with regard to his motives and intentions in making any communications to them. All these things will be attended to, and the writings examined in the natural order in which they are presented; noting every allusion and incident with the greatest circumspection, whether it regard time, place, or character. But above all, the most prominent object which the writer has in view, will be the most prominent in the consideration of a rational reader of his writings. And when difficulties occur, not to be satisfactorily solved by the mere import of the words, that meaning which best accords with the design of the whole writing, or with the particular passage, will be preferred.' "

Digitized by Google

In England and in the Canadas we rejoice to see new periodicals devoted to the dissemination of the grand redeeming principles of the present reformation. In the United States we have already a sufficient number in proportion to other religious communities—more, indeed, that can be well supported by the brethren and friends of the original Christian Institution. Still, however, I doubt not but they all do good to a certain extent, and probably if there were still more, they might do more good; yet we incline to the opinion that two or three, well supported and judiciously conducted, would exert a better influence and do more good than the dozen now in being. Such is our opinion; but we are not infallible, and therefore we cheerfully allow others to differ from us on better reasons. A. C.

Prophetic Department.

THE PROPHECIES—*NO. VI.*

THE prediction of Moses concerning the Great Prophet (Deut. xviii. 15—19.) is so plain and intelligible as not to require one word of comment. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken; according to all that thou desirest of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said to me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whoever will not hearken to my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him."

A *Prophet* is the burthen of this prophecy. A Prophet raised up like Moses—a Jew, who should speak only the words of God, and all the words of God—whose authority it would be unpardonable to resist, is indubitably evident. Whether this Prophet should be the woman's offspring, the Lord God of Shem, the promised seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "the Shiloh of Judah," "the Star of Jacob," "the Sceptre of Israel," might be a question; but that a Prophet bearing a divine commission of plenary authority, like Moses, should arise, cannot be questioned. An ambiguity rests upon whether the antecedent predictions relate to the same person. Is this Prophet to be a conqueror, a prince, a lawgiver, a universal benefactor, a star, a sceptre, might be asked; but that a Prophet uttering oracles of God of paramount authority, should arise out of Israel; and that to reject his word would be a sin of the deepest dye, cannot be doubted. This is, then, a fair sample of a plain unfigurative prediction.

Digitized by Google

Of the same character are the predictions of Moses touching the destiny of the Jewish people, as detailed in the 29th chapter of Deuteronomy. We have two captivities—the Chaldean and the Roman, foretold with astonishing precision. The Babylonian or Chaldean is sketched from the 32d to the 48th, and the Roman from the 49th to the 68th verse. Of the first Captivity it is said, 1st. "Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given to another people. The fruit of thy land, and all thy labors shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway." 2d. "The Lord shall bring thee and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; and thou shalt there serve other gods, wood and stone." [All this was written before they had a king.] 3d. "And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a by-word among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee." 4th. "Thou shalt not enjoy thy children; for they shall go into captivity." "Thine enemies shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck until they have destroyed thee," &c. &c.

The Roman Captivity is not merely sketched, but described almost to the full:—

1st. The Roman people are thus described: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from afar—from the end of the earth —as the *eagle* flieth—a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand—a nation of a fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young."

2d. This people were to invade their country and consume the products of their flocks and fields. "He shall eat the fruit of thy cattle and the fruit of thy land until thou be destroyed." Then,

3d. "He shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land.

4th. The distress to which they should be reduced in those last days of their national existence, is most minutely detailed. "And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and daughters which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege and in the straitness wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee," &c. &c.

5th. Various singular diseases and sicknesses are also foretold, and the consequent great reduction of the people. "And you shall be left few in number, whereas you were as the stars of heaven for multitude, because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the Lord thy God."

6th. "And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other, and amongst these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot

Digitized by Google

have rest; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes and sorrow of mind."

7th. And a portion of them were to be sold as slaves, and carried by ships into Egypt. "The Lord shall bring thee again into Egypt, in ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee; thou shalt see it no more again: and there you shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you."

These and many other particulars in the future fortunes of this people to the end of the Roman Captivity, are most descriptively delineated in plain unfigurative language by Moses in this long and wonderful prophecy.

Plain, however, as these predictions are, the knowledge of the subsequent history of the Jewish people and of the Chaldean and Roman Empires is indispensable to the correct application of them. Prophecy, therefore, as respects the destinies of the church and of the various states and empires of the world, demands, on the part of all its interpreters, an accurate knowledge of those records which contain the histories of the people, the times, and circumstances to which it belongs. For instance: the history of the Jews, as found in their own writers, from the time of Moses to the days of Josephus, and even down to the present time, as found in the records of other nations, is indispensable to a full intelligence of this single prophecy of Moses. But when these documents as now extant are examined and compared with these oracles of Moses, uttered 3300 years ago, there is no man of good sense can any more doubt the inspiration of Moses than he can doubt the plainest historic fact ever inscribed on the most faithful page of universal history. As the most exuberant vine often hangs upon a single elm, so the destiny of the whole human race hangs upon the shoulders of a single Jew: now as the fortunes of that people necessarily embrace the whole history of mankind, the shortest and best method of studying prophecy, universal prophecy, is to study it in connexion with the Jews.

In descending the current of prophecy and history from Adam to Moses, we observe that he that guided the tongues of the patriarchs and the pen of the great lawgiver of Israel, introduces and prosecutes no person, family, or incident farther than to sustain or illustrate something bearing upon, or involving the reputation of that single *branch* which was to fructify to the eternal honor and felicity of human kind.

Thus the genealogies before the flood are in the line of Seth, the illustrious substitute of the protomartyr Abel. Soon also recede from our view the genealogies of Ham and Japheth to make way for the more illustrious race of Shem. The descent from Shem is sacredly kept till the son of Terah stands conspicu-

Digitized by Google

ous on the chart of time. Then, of all the sons of Abraham, Isaac commands our attention till Jacob's fortune is dissociated from that of Esau, and of the twelve sons of Jacob. Joseph for a time, but ultimately Judah gains the ascendant till of his sons David is anointed king of Israel. Thus in the descent of time the roads often separate to the right and to the left; but the high way and the most conspicuous path is that which leads from Adam to David, and thence to David's Lord and David's people. We must, then, study prophecy always in the route which sacred history takes; and this, so far, is the best hint we can give to those who have patience to search devoutly and intensely for the coming glories of Messiah's reign, which are so soon to burst upon the astonished vision of a slumbering and a dreaming world.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

LETTERS TO ENGLAND—*No. III.*

MR. J. WALLIS:

Dear Sir—HAVING hastily and briefly sketched in my last epistle, the prominent boundaries of religious reformation, permit me to devote a letter or two to each of these three chapters which comprehend the whole burthen of our labors, as efficient and useful agents in the Messiah's kingdom.

Personal reformation does indeed include all reformation. A true and consistent Christian needs no reformation: he is the perfect work of God. The religious reformer, who is guided by the true light, never loses sight of this; and therefore, whether he labors to convert sinners or professed Christians, or to change religious institutions, he aims at that unit Christian perfection.

In doing the work of a Christian preacher, he has in his heart and in his eye a divine model after which to mould and fashion those erring souls whom he would allure from the doleful ways of death to the peaceful path that leads to God and heaven. He has *three* things in view in converting sinners; and these are his *disposition*, *state* and *character*. These are all to be changed. The book of God, his own experience, and observation teach him that man is an *unnatural* being till he is converted to God. Adam while he was natural was beloved of his God: for nature is as pleasing to God as grace. The God of grace is the God of nature. But man continued not in nature: he rebelled and became unnatural, and therefore religion that was at first natural to man has become supernatural.

Digitized by Google

The error of Atheism, Deism, and Libertinism is one and the same. They all suppose man to be in the state of nature; and ask, Where is the sin in obeying his *natural* instincts, passions, propensities! None at all, indeed, provided only they prove their assumption *that man is now found in the state of nature.* But this assumption of theirs being a manifest falsehood, all their reasonings from it are false and deceitful. Were their premises true, virtue would consist in obeying one's inclinations and passions; but as it is, the more fully any one obeys his inclinations and passions, the farther is he from reason and truth.

Man is fallen from nature, and is now in preternatural circumstances, so far certainly as his intellectual and moral nature is considered; and he has no disposition to return to nature, nor to seek that which is spiritual or supernatural, till God seek him. Unnatural Adam asks not for God till God says, "Adam, where art thou?" God has, then, instituted the means of reconciliation; and all his ministers to earth, whether they are angelic or human, are ministers of reconciliation or of vengeance. "Mercy, however, rejoiceth against judgment;" and therefore the ministry of reconciliation first, and that of judgment afterwards.

The changing of the disposition has in the divine economy the priority of all other changes, whether of state or character; and to this the Christian preacher supremely directs his efforts; whether it is called change of heart, or will, or nature, or disposition. Heaven has made the first advance—"He first loved us." This must be revealed to the sinner. It must be proved, illustrated, and enforced upon his attention. The divine name, being, perfections, purposes, and wonderful works of grace must be clearly, fully, and faithfully laid before him, and he must be spoken to as a rational and responsible being. Theory is of no use here except to the preacher. In changing disposition motives not speculations are to be tendered to the sinner. God always works by suitable motives, moral means; and if we expect him to work by us, we must work with him.

Disposition is singular and not plural in the sense in which it is now contemplated. It is a bias, leaning, or inclination towards God. It may be strong or weak comparatively; but it is certainly such a leaning as were it transferred to a tree, would cause it to fall to the object to which it inclines. It is a fixed purpose to obey in all things the authority of God.

The disposition of which we speak has indeed many counterfeits. Many awakened persons have a disposition to obey the will of God in some things which they deem essential to their salvation. But their own personal safety is the measure of their determination or inclination to obedience. These are not of that class of which we speak. The

Digitized by Google

Christian disposition is a fixed purpose of universal obedience in every known and knowable divine requisition, whether for our own good or that of others.

State must be distinguished from *disposition*, and it must be changed as well as the disposition. It imports *the relation in which one's whole person stands to God and the universe.* The Christian is in a justified, reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and saved state. While character is the work of time, a change of state is, or may be, the work of a moment. And while there may be a thousand degrees of comparative excellence in Christian character or of conformity to its perfect model, there are no degrees in justification, pardon, or adoption, more than there are in marriage, paternity, fraternity or citizenship. As soon as Jesus said, "*Thy sins be forgiven thee, go and sin no more,*" the state of the transgressor was changed. Paul's justification was an act of God's grace, *through appointed means;* but Paul's Christian character was the result of his own efforts. So is it in every other case.

Christian character is "*the fruit of the Spirit,*" the result of disposition, conformity to the new state. Now, proficiency in this is gradual and progressive. New motives sometimes suddenly create new dispositions. These fit the person for a change of state, which always is instantaneous. But these two co-operate in the formation of character, the perfection of which is the result of all the efforts of a life controlled by the revealed will of God.

The Christian is a justified person—one whose disposition is that of universal obedience, and whose character is an image of God's beloved Son. His heart is the residence of God's gracious spirit, and his life is consecrated to the Lord. There is no one more honorable than such a personage; for God is his Father, Jesus the Lord his elder brother, and the Holy Spirit his constant guest; angels are his ministering attendants, heaven his inheritance, and the mansions of glory are his eternal home. Hence there is none on earth more noble, purer, holier, or happier than the Christian; and there will be none higher or more dignified in heaven than he.

To dig such heavenly statues out of the quarry of corrupted and degraded human nature, requires more than an earthly chisel, or the skilful hand of a human statuary. "It is God's own work, and it is marvellous in our eyes." But it is an effect of means ingeniously contrived and skilfully applied. To apply the tools is not exclusively the office of their Maker: the sword of God's Spirit may be used by human hands, and skilfully wielded by a Timothy, a Titus, an Epaphras, or an Apollos, as well as by an Apostle or a Prophet. It is not called "*the Sword of the Spirit*" so much on account of him who uses it, as of

Digitized by Google

him who fashioned it. Hence, Paul claimed to be the father of many children to God. The means he used were God's grace; still he claims to have begotten all his converts, and to be in truth their father. His converts, he admits, might have many instructers; but they could have but one father—viz. himself. By *the gospel* he had begotten them.

The gospel, then, must be preached as it was in the beginning, by all those who would *reform*, *remould*, or *regenerate* men. The same mint is essential to the same coin. The primitive mould will always develope the primitive character, for no other mint in the universe can issue an English guinea, other than an English mint. So of the Christian and the Christian mint.

Having written so largely upon each of these, we rather allude to these distinctions than develope them in these remarks. We do this for the sake of directing the attention of our fellow-laborers to the philosophy of the Bible, and to the folly of attempting the conversion of sinners by a display of controversial, speculative, and dogmatic theology. The primitive preachers announced the wonderful works and design of Heaven in sending the Messiah into the world, from which they deduced motives rationally and morally adapted to effect that change of disposition, state, and character which the gospel proposes as prerequisite to a glorious immortality.

May favor, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our divine Redeemer, be multiplied to you and all the brethren with you!

Your fellow-servant in the kingdom of the Messiah,

A. CAMPBELL.

News from the Churches.

Boon County, Mo., June 14, 1837.

On Friday before the 5th Lord's day in April last a three days meeting commenced in Paris, Monroe county. Brother Wills and I attended. We also met brother Thomas, Reed, Thompson, and Sidenor of the teaching brethren; but as brother Wills and myself were the greatest strangers, we of course done the principal speaking. We continued until Monday. Seven were added during the meeting. We found the brethren numerous and apparently doing well in Monroe, there being five flourishing congregations in the county, one of them numbering upwards of one hundred members; and from the vast crowds that attended during the meeting, with the profound attention and deep interest manifested, I infer the prospect is fine for doing good. Our worthy brother Stone was in Paris the following Lord's day, when three others were added to the Lord; and I have recently been informed that at a

Digitized by Google

meeting lately held by brother Sidenor, ten were united to the Saviour in one of the congregations of Monroe. I think it highly probable that, according to the old Quaker's definition, we are *orthodox* in that county.

On the third Lord's day in May and Saturday before we held a meeting in Columbia. Our venerable brother B. W. Stone was with us on that occasion. It was an interesting meeting—large congregations and solemn attention. Eight were added to the congregation.

The following Saturday and Lord's day brother Stone and I were in Fayette, Howard county. Two only made the good confession there, though I trust that great good will result from our labors at that place.

On last Lord's day, the 2d inst., I was with the friends near Fulton in Callaway county. Our congregations were large, solemn, and attentive. At the conclusion of our speaking four came forward and took their stand upon the foundation God has laid in Zion. In the afternoon I addressed a large congregation at the water: many were weeping, and appeared almost persuaded to be Christians. I am encouraged to anticipate a large increase to the Lord in that section of country before long.

On the first Sunday of this month two confessed Jesus, and were baptized at brother A. Miller's, in the church of Millersburg. The *Bible* cause is evidently on rising ground in this part of Missouri; and all, in my humble opinion, that is wanting to make it triumphant, is a sufficient number of efficient Christian teachers and faithfulness on the part of professors. May the Lord enable us to be faithful, and grant that much good may be done in the name of Jesus!

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

Fredericksburg, Va., July 5, 1835.

Brethren Coleman, Goss, Henshall, and Ferguson have visited us, and have revived our hearts by breaking down the prejudice of many against us "Campbellites," as the sects and world term us. Do, if possible, visit us this year. Many in our immediate neighborhood are very desirous that we should send some of our proclaimers to them; but this we cannot do, because the laborers are scarce. The section called the Northern Neck has never been visited by a preacher of the apostolic doctrine. THOMAS P. MILLS.

Solon, Ohio, July 10, 1837.

I have been a short tour from home in company with my brother Sutton and brother William Moody, in Lorrain county—held three meetings and immersed eleven persons. Six have been immersed in Shalersville since the yearly meeting there.

WILLIAM HAYDEN.

Stanford, Ky., July 11, 1837.

I arrived here last evening, having visited Paris, Carlisle, Athens, Chilesburg, Lexington, Richmond, Mount Vernon, &c. I attended a meeting with brother J. T. Johnson at Richmond and in its neighborhood. Three persons were immersed before I left Madison county. Falling in with brother Calahan at Mount Vernon, I came on with him to Crab Orchard and held a two days' meeting. A good impression was made, and nine persons added to the church—eight immersed—one received from the Baptist church. R. RICHARDSON.

Digitized by Google

COVINGTON, Tipton county, Ten., May 21, 1837.

Not to be further ceremonious, I continue to labor in the Lord's vineyard, and, thanks to my heavenly Father, not without some good effect. Since my last letter I have immersed seven, one of whom is my youngest daughter. The few brethren that are here continue their meetings for worship. The public mind is relieved of many false impressions respecting the disciples of Messiah. PEYTON SMITH.

POWHATAN COUNTY, Va., February 24, 1837.

Although we are but a feeble band, yet I hope we are healthy in the good cause. We have undertaken to build us a house in which to worship the God of our fathers: the Lord willing, we shall be enabled to complete it the next spring. In this respect we act independently: we have asked help of none but our brethren, and hope we shall be able to meet our engagements. ROBERT WREN, SR.

VALPARAISO, Porter county, Ia., June 22, 1837.

I wrote you some time ago that I thought the prospect fair for ingathering in this country. I have now the pleasure to inform you that the prospect brightens. People's minds in this county are taken up with the truth, insomuch that they have commenced searching the Scriptures to see if the things of which we speak are so.

On the first day of last week we commenced organizing a congregation in the town of Valparaiso. Eleven members united together as a congregation, taking for their discipline the doctrine of Jesus and his Apostles alone; and there is a great prospect for good to be done more abundantly. C. W. TURNER.

LEXINGTON, Ky., June 29, 1837.

I removed to Lexington something over two years ago. The congregation in this place did not at that time number over seventy or eighty, and at this time we number one hundred and seventy-nine; and having within five or six years been a member of several different congrations, and having acquired a very extensive information in relation to the situation of a number of churches in the reformation; I am proud to say, that, in point of scriptural intelligence, order, discipline, and respectability, we lose nothing by comparison with any congregation within my knowledge. Nevertheless we have something to complain of:—A few of our young brethren, judging from their acts, have a greater love for visiting places of public amusement, such as barbacues, &c. than they have for the assembly of the saints. These things, in my judgment, ought not so to be; and we are about taking steps to reclaim all such as are not too far gone back into the world by the allurements of these things; for it has been an observation of mine for the last ten years, that all apostacies commence by *littles*, and the greater part of them, particularly in towns, have their origin in the causes above mentioned.
J. G. CHINN.

YORK COUNTY, Va., July 3, 1837.

The cause in our part of Virginia seems to make very slow progress for the want of proclaimers possessing a sufficient portion of the good old Paul spirit, which would be willing to suffer some loss and hardship for the cross of Christ. But, unfortunately for the cause, our talented brethren think too highly of themselves; and, instead of travelling and

Digitized by Google

spreading the good news of salvation to a dying world, they have most of them set themselves down in their easy chairs as Editors, and thus the cause suffers; for such is the state of things that none but the friends will pay for and take their papers, and we are only heard by very few. If brothers Burnet, Hall, or any other brother would come among us and assist our brethren Henshall, Curtis, and Elliott in lower Virginia, there might be many churches planted and raised up. I thank God that there have been some members added to our church in the last twelve or eighteen months, who seem to understand the gospel plan of entering the kingdom of Christ; and we are now in number about 25 or 30, continuing in the Apostles' doctrine and breaking bread every first day of the week. I have myself for the last six weeks been going to James City to meet the brethren there, and they begin now to meet regularly every first day of the week, and attend to the ordinances of the Lord's house. May the Great Head of the Church continue to help us in standing firm against all opposition!

R. H. WHITAKER.

NOTTINGHAM, Harrison county, Ohio, July 4, 1837.

Through the goodness of the Almighty Preserver I am permitted this morning to recount a few of his mercies to the children of men. On the 8th of June five were obedient to the faith in the Liberty congregation, Guernsey county. The disciples here have commenced worshipping in their new meeting-house; two Deacons were ordained the Lord's day before. From thence I visited Belmont county: the Barnesville congregation is doing well, growing in grace and knowledge; three made the good confession and were baptized into, &c. We assisted them in ordaining an Elder and a Deacon: *now* they have three Bishops and Deacons. We visited a congregation of disciples at Boston, 8 miles south of Barnesville: five put on the Lord Jesus by baptism, and several were won over from the sects. Two Deacons were ordained during our stay; so that they now have Bishops and Deacons agreeably to the gospel. Eight have, within a few days, been immersed for the remission of sins, in this place, (Nottingham;) thus the good work goes on. The fields are white—waiting for the sickle. If my health would admit of my laboring regularly, a great ingathering to the fold of Christ would assuredly be the result. ROBERT COOK.

CENTREVILLE, Bourbon county, Ky., July 5, 1837.

As an observer of events here, and one who feels a deep and abiding interest in the advancement of Messiah's kingdom, for your information permit me to say that in general there is not a sufficient degree of zeal and earnestness, piety and circumspection manifested among the friends of primitive Christianity. As an humble laborer, while endeavoring to enlighten their minds, I often succeed, I trust, rightly warming their hearts; but this effect soon dies away in commingling with the fashionable, *trading*, *selfish*, *wicked* world. Do the brethren and sisters conform too much to this passing world? Are they too little transformed in mind, heart, and conduct? Do earthly honor, wealth and show captivate their minds; and do they look up to, rather than down upon these things? Are the pride of life and the lust of the eye never evinced among us? To all these queries a painful affirmative must be given. But yet, despite of all the causes that retard and oppose our onward and upward march, methinks a brighter day is beginning to dawn on

Digitized by Google

the world. The Son of God reigns in the hearts of some at least.—Within the last month some seven or eight have been immersed in this section of country under my humble labors.

I wish well to the Institution in Georgetown, (Bacon College.) If freed from all sectarian influence, and the morals of youth are strictly attended to, it cannot but prove a blessing to society; but I fear that its interests and its prosperity are becoming too closely identified with the interests and prosperity of the cause of Christ in Kentucky. I have all affection for, and confidence in brothers Scott, Johnson, and Hunter; but I am unwilling, when I consider the party and personal opposition and ill-will, excited too by *various causes*, at the birth of that Institution, that it shall be viewed as a part or even an appendage of the reformation for which we plead. The cause of Christ is one thing—the College another—as essentially distinct as the church of Christ and this republican government Let every *Christian parent* bring his or her children to the Lord's house on the Lord's day, and teach them the Lord's word. This is the school of Christ—this is training children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The College, if they want, should have a paper of their own. The Christian should plead for Christ.

JNO. ALLEN GANO.

BLACK LOCUST GROVE, Mo., May 24, 1837.

When I wrote you last, I informed you of our constituting with four members; since which time we made a proposition for all immersed believers of good standing, (especially to the church that had been trying to get along on the part of the gospel that Paul preached, but had hitherto failed, in part at least,) and who were determined to live according to the word of God, to unite together for that purpose; which we accordingly did. We now number about thirty-eight—have elected two Bishops and three Deacons, and now meet every Lord's day to break bread, join in prayer and praise, mutual exhortation, and preaching the word. The people are very attentive and seem full of curiosity. The officers of the church as yet are only on trial or proof; but there seems to be some difficulty about the manner of proving them; for the Apostle says, "Let these also be *first* proved, *then* let them exercise the deacon's office," &c. Some light on this subject, if you please; for I do not recollect ever seeing any thing on that particular point. Has a Christian church the right to elect her officers for a short period of time in order to prove them?——There is a Baptist church near us, which a few weeks ago excluded, or rather withdrew from B. W. Ryley, because he had said unless they would do away their human creed and worship according to the word of the Lord, he must be permitted to withdraw and to seek some place where *he* at least could do so. But what he will now do I presume not to say. A. H. F. PAYNE.

WILLIAM BALLANTINE'S MANUSCRIPTS.

THROUGH the Christian benevolence of Mrs. Cole, of New Jersey, daughter of our late much esteemed and amiable brother William Ballantine, one of the Elders of the church in Philadelphia, his remaining manuscripts containing lectures and criticisms on many interesting subjects of sacred literature and religious truth, were forwarded to us some months since. In the great mass of business on hand, it was impossible for us to examine this treasure immediately on its arrival. We have not yet been able fully to do this; but in the mean time have *loaned* them to brother Burnet of the "Christian Preacher," that he might decide whether he might not greatly enrich his periodical or make a separate volume or two of discourses and criticisms from these erudite and pious labors of one of the most learned and excellent men of the last generation. We expect to hear from him soon on this subject. A. C.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER IX.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *September*, 1837.

Discussion of Universalism.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

No. VII.

UTICA, July 18th, 1837.

1. *My dear Sir*—Yours of June 29th has just come to hand. Accept my thanks that you have now settled the preliminaries of this discussion to our mutual satisfaction. The long and wide digression concerning them, was not of my seeking; and its termination, therefore, belonged to you. You seem, in conceding simple justice to me, to grant it as a matter of great grace and condescension on your part. Well, call it *grace* or *justice*, I am equally well satisfied, as I am afraid of neither; and as Universalists are so seldom able to obtain any thing approximating even-handed justice, from their opposing brethren, I am even thankful that (however long delayed or bad the grace with which it is given) you have at last conceded it. In reference to your other remarks about the preliminaries, and particularly about your having "given up the whole" to my "own dictation," I would observe, that you seem to have greatly altered your mind since your last letter. In that you said I had "acceded to the rules of evidence" proposed by you "to be relied on, and in the main, yielded to the rules to be observed," and had "finally come up to all" your "little quibbles," etc.

2—In reply to what you say in your third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs, about the apparent design of "destroying your reputation with the readers of this paper," on the eve of the commencement of this discussion, I will remark, that I never saw or knew any thing of the articles mentioned by your New York correspondent, as published in this paper of March 10th and February 24th, till after they were published. And had your correspondent quoted the whole paragraph by Mr. Grosh, instead of taking garbled and disjointed extracts, you would have seen that the article, instead of assailing your reputation, was actually written to defend it from a recent assault made upon it by a cotemporary journal in Rochester, N. Y., which has nothing to do with this discussion.

Digitized by Google

Thus, sir, you see you have not been so greatly dishonored in our columns after all. But your modesty in disclaiming the expectation of any "honor in this earthly world, from the most ample refutation of each and every" of the "pretensions" of Universalism, is only equalled by your affected contempt of the system. I shall leave it to wiser heads than mine to say what you could justly be compared to, if, on trial, you should find your powers inadequate to refute Universalism, which, you say, "is *incomparably the weakest* cause in Christendom."

3—In view of the above, and the serious difficulty you complain of in your seventh paragraph, and similar difficulties all along complained of, since you commenced addressing me, every master of sound logic and every skilful theological controversialist, must truly commiserate your unhappy destiny. To see so great a master in logic and controversy—one who is "logically and grammatically, as well as theologically and religiously," qualified to "put into the mouths" of novices "the *bits* of logic," and to "throw around their necks the *reins* of reason"—to appeal on all occasions to the "oracle of reason"—to keep constantly "the canons of logic and philosophy in his eye"—to subject all matters "to the canons of criticism and laws of language current in the commonwealth of letters"—to see such a man linked in controversy with one embracing a system, "the barrenness of whose genius" is such as in the first place to induce him "informally, illogically, and lawlessly to rush into the arena"—a system that has so stultified his intellect, as to make him incapable of enditing any thing but "headless, pointless, wide-spreading declamation," distinguished for nothing but "its impotency," and which contains "not a single argument that will bear the line and plummet of sound sense and logical discretion"—all this, sir, is peculiarly calculated to excite the sympathy and commiseration of great logicians. It is, forsooth, too bad!

4—In despite of the scintillations of your genius and system, so great still is the obtuseness of my intellect that I can discover no more stultifying of each other in my propositions than in yours. Take now the four questions you proposed in your April letter:—"1. Is there any punishment for sin? 2. If any, is that punishment present or future? 3. If future, is that future before or after death? 4. If after death, is it temporary or eternal?" Now, sir, I put it to your own conscience whether your second question does not stultify the first? the third the second? and whether the simple question, "Is eternal [endless] punishment true?" would not have stultified all the preceding questions? See Rom. ii. 1. The merriment introduced into your 12th paragraph about the "mystic theologian," is therefore at your own expense.

5—In your 10th paragraph you appear exceedingly happy, almost overjoyed, at the wonderful *concession* I have made, viz. *that the punishment of the wicked is set forth under other terms than sheol, hades*, or *gehenna*. If, my dear sir, I had known this admission would have pleased you so well, I would have made it the very first paragraph I wrote to you—nay, I would have furnished you with a number of instances in *proof* of its truth—I would have referred you to the first punishment for sin recorded in the Bible, the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, to the sentences upon the serpent and upon Cain, the drowning of the old world, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the plagues of Egypt, and hundreds of other similar cases of pun-

Digitized by Google

ishment both individual and national, where not a syllable is said about *hell;* but after all, such is the obstinate obtuseness of my intellect, that I am utterly incapable of perceiving what possible advantage you, or any one of your positions, could have derived from such concession.

6—You complain of me, not because the propositions for discussion are unfavorable, but because they are *too* favorable to you—I am generous even to a fault. Very well, sir—make the most you can of your vantage ground. I am contented. But, sir, if you fail to substantiate your position relative to either of the first three propositions, so many of your strongest ramparts fall. And if I prove the affirmative of the fourth, your whole system of endless sin and misery falls.

7—In reply to your 15th paragraph, I would simply ask, Why, my dear sir, did you take back with so much indignation the concession made in a former letter concerning *sheol, hades, and gehenna,* as though the concession were likely to prove fatal to your cause, if in fact it were a matter of no consequence?

8—Your parody of my apostrophe, or what you are pleased to call my rhapsody, is a perfectly futile attempt to shift the difficulty, in which you are involved, over to my side of the question. You ask 'were the controversy about the endless happiness of the saints,' whether your 'version or imitation' would not be, 'to a scruple, as exactly in point as what you [I] have written.' I answer unhesitatingly, *No.* And for this reason: neither the Hebrew *Shemim*, the Greek *Ouranos*, nor the Persian *Paradiseos*, nor, I may add, the Latin *Coelum*, nor English *Heaven*, is ever relied on by any Universalist, nor any other enlightened Christian, as proof of *'the endless happiness of the saints.'* The endless happiness of the saints is attested in Scripture by a very different kind of proof. And how very few are the instances where the words *shemim, ouranos*, and *heaven* are used to designate either the place or state of the endless happiness of the saints, compared to the vast number of instances where they are used in a very different sense! How very different then the case you name. It is not at all in point.

9—Your 16th and 17th paragraphs fairly 'stultify' me. Were you dreaming, sir, or what were you about when you penned that most outrageous perversion both of the language and sentiment of the quoted dogma? When and where, sir, did you ever hear any intelligent Universalist say that *'repentance* is the *only hell* or state of punishment' or any thing tantamount to it? Never, my dear sir, since God made you. As well might it be affirmed that a *birch tree* is *holiness*, because with a branch therefrom you have chastised your disobedient child, and produced humility and reformation, which has resulted in confirmed holiness of character. I do not wonder, sir, after delivering yourself of such a perversion, that you involuntarily remarked, that you did 'not feel rhapsodic or elated,' especially if you have any conscience! What you say about Messiah's appearance and mediation being a mere pageant, would be measurably true were his appearance and mediation to be regarded in the light of your system—a system that represents him as coming to save an alienated and lapsed world, and after much display and pretension, only succeeding in rescuing a *small part* of the general wreck, and dooming the rest to *a far more hopeless condition* than he found them in. But Universalism makes his mediation no pageant, but a triumphantly successful effort to reconcile and save from sin and death a whole world of intelligent beings.

Digitized by Google

10—In your 18th paragraph you assume that it is 'probable' [so you are reduced to a mere PROBABILITY] that 'gehenna was used by our Lord to represent PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH'—and 'perhaps' [so here you are reduced to a mere POSSIBILITY of being right] 'it meant sometimes—[NOT ALWAYS] BY ITS ADJUNCTS [not by itself] EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT!' Sir, is not that cause 'incomparably weak' that has nothing but bare POSSIBILITY in its favor, and that based wholly on ASSUMPTION without the least particle of proof, or any attempt at proof? In the quotation you pretend in this paragraph to make from me, why do you not quote me fairly? Why garble my question to my disadvantage? My language was, that '*Christ* never preached gehenna punishment to any but Jews,' but that 'neither Christ *nor his Apostles* ever' did it—'that NONE of them ever preached or lisped a syllable of it to Gentiles, or AUTHORIZED OTHERS TO DO IT.' Is there any thing in this incompatible with the fact that Christ's personal ministry was limited to the house of Israel? Moreover, did not Christ himself preach salvation *for*, if not *to*, the Gentiles? See Matt. viii. 11, 12, and xxi. 41—43, and Luke xiii. 28, 29. And did he not commission his Apostles to preach salvation *to* Gentiles? Mark xvi. 15, and its parallels. Why then, I repeat, if Gentiles were liable to GEHENNA FIRE or PUNISHMENT, were they NEVER threatened with it? Could it not have been explained to them as well as YOU can now explain it to me? That the Apostles did not mention SHEMIM nor PARADISE, nor ABRAHAM'S BOSOM to the Gentiles, is evidence that they did not regard them as any proof of immortal beatitude.

11—In reply to your 19th paragraph, I remark that if I erred in conceding too little in regard to the figurative meaning of GEHENNA, I have erred in very good company. That the word is used literally and in its primary sense in Matth. v. 22, appears to have been the opinion of Drs. Parkhurst, Macknight, Rosenmuller, Heylen, Winne, Wakefield, and A. Clarke. See their notes, comments, and illustrations of the passage—and their opinion that the punishment here threatened was BURNING ALIVE IN THE LITERAL VALLEY OF HINNOM. The above commentators happen to be on your side of the main question.

12—Your 20th paragraph being mostly quotations from the Bible, I am highly pleased with; and notwithstanding you take considerable pains to put in capitals and italics certain words and phrases, I see very little prospect of your being able thereby to make out your case. I would only inquire relative to the last passage quoted, if your definition of GEHENNA be correct, and it have the same meaning in all places, whether we are to understand James as saying that the TONGUE of his brethren was SET ON FIRE OF ENDLESS MISERY, OR EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT? Your 21st paragraph is a medley of truisms and assertions without argument, requiring no other answer than will be found in reply to the preceding and succeeding paragraph.

13—I fully endorse all you say in your 22d paragraph, with all its ET CETERAS, ET CETERAS, excepting only the last sentence; and cordially maintain that ' 'GEHENNA is contrasted with 'LIFE' and 'the kingdom of God,' ' &c. 'And now I ask [assert that] whatever is meant by ENTERING INTO LIFE, the very opposite of that is going into, or being CAST INTO GEHENNA.' Are you prepared to abide the issue? That 'life,' 'entering into life,' 'passing from death unto life,' 'entering into the

Digitized by Google

kingdom of God,' 'kingdom of heaven,' etc. do not in the Scriptures generally signify future and eternal bliss, or entering into immortal beatitude, I think must be ovious to the most superficial of biblical critics. 'I am the bread of *life*'—'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are *life*.' John vi. 35, 63. 'He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, HATH EVERLASTING LIFE, and shall not come into condemnation; but IS PASSED FROM DEATH UNTO LIFE.' John v. 24. 'The kingdom of God is come unto you.' Matt. xii. 28. 'For ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men.' Matt xxiii. 13. See also Matt. xi. 12, and xviii. 1, 4. Luke xvii. 20, 21. John iii. 36; xi. 25; xvii. 3; xx. 31. Rom. xiv. 17. 1 John iii. 14; and parallels too numerous to name. That these and similar phrases signify in general the gospel dispensation, Messiah's reign, the joy and peace of believers, and the privileges of faith and hope therein, I think even you will not deny on further reflection. And so far from its being true that "all Christendom admits' that they denote 'future and eternal bliss,' the learned Dr. HAMMOND says—and with him agree the learned LIGHTFOOT, KNATCHBULL, WYNNE, HEYLEN, the COMPILERS OF THE DUTCH ANNOTATIONS, POOLE'S CONTINUATORS, and many other eminent critics on your side of the house—that the 'phrase BASILEIA TON OURANON, or TOU THEOU, the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, or OF GOD, signifies in the New Testament, the kingdom of Messias, or that the state or condition which is a most lively image of that which we believe to be in heaven, and therefore called by that name.' Now, sir, if, as you say, going into or being CAST INTO GEHENNA. is the very opposite of entering into the kingdom of God, entering into life, etc., as exhibited in the above quotations, it must mean, on your own premises, that mental and moral darkness and perplexity which the rejectors of the gospel experienced, and the woes and calamities that befel them in consequence thereof. They have seen the Gentiles sitting down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, reclining in Abraham's bosom (or faith,) and they themselves thrust out into EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT for nearly 1800 years since the destruction of their city—a condition 'the very opposite' of that of every true believer. 'For we which have believed, DO ENTER INTO REST.' Heb. iv. 3.

14—What you say in paragraph 23d, about considering the ADJUNCTS of GEHENNA by way of substitution, as well as contrast, will be sufficiently answered by a few scriptural citations, where the same or still stronger phraseology is used respecting 'EVERLASTING FIRE—FIRE THAT SHALL NEVER BE QUENCHED,' etc., and evidently applied to mere temporal things and punishments. 'The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out.' Lev. v. 13. 'A fire is kindled in my wrath, and shall burn unto the lowest hell.' Deut. xxxii. 22. 'It shall not be quenched night nor day: the smoke thereof shall go up forever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever.' Isa. xxxiv. 10. 'For their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.' Isa. lxvi. 24. Now, sir, I am confident you will not risk your reputation, as a scholar or theologian, by affirming that either of these texts refers to any thing beyond this state of being. Why, then, should you make an exception to the common scriptural import of similar phraseology, when found in connexion with GEHENNA? Is this

Digitized by Google

your 'Lynch-law of Theology?' If it be not a Lynch-law, it is surely an *ex post facto law*, of which the Scriptures and the Scripture writers knew nothing.

15—The unsupported ASSERTIONS and swaggering ASSUMPTIONS of your 24th, 30th, and 31st paragraphs, so ludicrously interlarded with the *petitio principii*, or begging of the question, together with your attempt at ridicule in your 28th, I need not notice. It is sufficient that I notice what bears the semblance of argument. Your hypercritical corrections of my grammar, as in the commencement of your 27th paragraph, where a SINGULAR VERB is made to agree with ONE NOUN SINGULAR expressed in TWO languages, and numerous other examples of the same disposition in your letters, I shall hereafter pay no attention to, though I have in a few instances followed your example, as a mere *caveat* to you.

16—When your 25th paragraph is reduced in 'my crucible' to its legitimate QUANTUM, and tried by the 'canons of logic and philosophy,' I find nothing of it—at least nothing that is applicable to this discussion.

17—What you say in the close of your 26th paragraph, is not true, if Jesus the true Prophet spake truly, and authentic historians are to be believed. For instead of 'escaping the punishment of gehenna in the heaven of Universalism,' upon that generation of unbelieving Jews came the righteous retributions which had been for ages accumulating, and they endured the full measure of the DAMNATION OF HELL, or GEHENNA PUNISHMENT. See Matt. xxi. 41—44; xxiii. 35, 36; xxiv. 15, 21, 34; Luke xiii. 28; and Josephus' account of the destruction of Jerusalem.

18—In your 27th paragraph, you speak of my 'Lynch-law of theology.' But, sir, I leave it to our readers to say whether my definition of *hades*, and the use I made of the text, (the subject of your complaint,) was any thing near as LYNCH-LIKE as your gross perversion and misrepresentation of my definition in that very paragraph. If the reader will consult again my second and third definitions of *sheol* and *hades*, he will perceive that my version of Psalm ix. 17, was, 'The wicked shall experience severe judgments, great afflictions, sudden temporal destruction,' and perhaps also 'a distressing sense of guilt, remorse of conscience, great mental anguish.' Let us have, then, no more of this wilful perversion. You, sir, had given your definition of *hades*, and then quoted Ps. ix. 17, not merely as an example of your sense, but you attempted to make your readers believe that Universalists always explained *sheol* or *hades* in this text, to mean the *grave*. I gave my definition, and, to disabuse our readers of that false imputation, cited and explained the same text and several others, in the different senses in which the word *sheol*, or *hades*, was used. And you have made no effort to prove my definition or version incorrect; but accuse me of adopting the 'Lynch-law of theology,' merely for disabusing our readers of your false insinuation!

19—That the *fable* you give in your 29th paragraph, is a spurious version, will appear evident from these facts: that God said to Adam, 'The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt *surely die*.' The serpent said to Eve, 'Ye shall *not* surely die.' Now Universalists believe that Adam *did* die the *very death* that was threatened, and on the *very day* of transgression. But my good friend, Mr. Campbell, does not believe it. He thinks the death there threatened, was *eternal* death—that Adam not

Digitized by Google

only did not die the threatened death THEN, but NEVER WILL—that though all mankind are threatened with it, they shall NOT all SURELY die—that it is even *possible* for all to escape it, if they will. He therefore thinks that God was mistaken, and the serpent told the truth. So it appears that his 'sooty majesty' was not merely 'a graduate' but Principal Professor in the school whence he and his brethren 'of like precious faith' graduated. It is true that Universalism was preached in the Garden, but by a different Professor. It was preached in the declaration that 'the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.'

30—In your next I shall expect something bearing the semblance of *proof* in favor of your positions, or in answer to the arguments contained in my February letter. The proof-sheet of this will be mailed for you on the 21st inst.

Very respectfully and sincerely yours,

D. SKINNER.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER.

No. VIII.

BETHANY, Va., August 1, 1837.

1. *My dear Sir*—YOURS of the 18th ult. arrived yesterday. No thanks are due me for settling preliminaries to "mutual satisfaction." That has not been done. You may, indeed, thank me for having given up every litigated point to your entire satisfaction. Your thanks would have been in order had you substituted *my* for "mutual."

2—Your 2d and 3d paragraphs have no bearing on the question before us. Your 4th admits the justice of my strictures on your four propositions; but you defend your nullifications, &c. upon the ground that my four questions were objectionable on the same score. Shrewd, indeed! To allow a person to select one out of five questions, is, in your optics, identical with compelling him to discuss the whole. To be asked at table to partake of any one of five dishes, is, in your reason, equivalent to be compelled to digest another five! To offer for selection four or five *homogeneous* propositions, and to constrain the discussion of just so many *heterogeneous* points, are just the same thing!! Having in the very elements of your defence admitted all that I alleged in my general review of your positions, I feel no necessity of farther demonstrating the entire dissimilarity of the case you urge to protect you. Without farther comment, I fearlessly refer the review to all our readers.

3—You candidly allow (paragraph 6) that your first three propositions only reach the ramparts, the mere outposts of the besieged city; and wisely say, "If I [you] prove the affirmative of the fourth, my whole system of endless sin and misery falls." Yes—*if*—*if* you prove the fourth! Aye, that is the point: for this not proved, yourself being judge, your other toils are vain and useless. Hasten then, my dear sir, to the fourth. That is the vital point—and the affirmative is yours.

4—The first point of interest bearing on the question before us, is in your 8th paragraph. My parody upon your apostrophe you allege is not in point. Here we are at issue; and it is an important issue. The great point with your school on the first proposition is, *that Geheuna*

Digitized by Google

originally meant the Valley of Hinnom, as we have been told a thousand times: *therefore it cannot represent a state of punishment after death in another world.* This is your great *enthymeme.* Syllogistically expressed, it would read in full—

5.—*Whatever word has represented a place of physical misery in this life, cannot represent a state of future misery after death.*

But Gehenna has represented a place of physical misery in this life:

Therefore, Gehenna cannot represent a state of future misery after death.

6—Now, sir, answer me unequivocally, and say whether the above syllogism does not state the point, to illustrate and prove which, the ten thousand pages written about Gehenna have been published from Georgia to Maine. Be definite, and explicit too, on this question: for here I do claim for the truth a decided victory. Out of the lips of Universalists themselves I refute these ten thousand pages, by showing that their syllogism and philology as fully prove that the words *shemim, ouranos, coelum, heaven*, because they originally signified the sensible air and the visible sky, cannot signify a state or place of future happiness after death: I say, the case is precisely similar. Take the Hebrew *shemim* and *gehenna*, or the Saxon *heaven* and *hell*, and compare their history, and there are not two cases more parallel in universal language. HELL has often denoted the vale of Hinnom, the pit, the grave, and sometimes a state of punishment after death. HEAVEN in like manner has often denoted the air, the region of the sun, moon, and stars; the blue ethereal, exaltation, and sometimes the state of future happiness after death. Do you, Mr. Skinner, deny this? If so, say it distinctly. If you do not deny it, then I ask you, *Are not these two cases parallel?* Compare the following with the preceding syllogism:—

7—*Whatever word has represented a place of physical enjoyment in this life, cannot represent a state of future enjoyment after death.*

But SHEMIM *has represented a place of physical enjoyment in this life:*

Therefore, SHEMIM *cannot represent a state of future enjoyment after death.*

8—You may have another still more precise case, if this one is not fully satisfactory. For example:—

Whatever word originally signified a state of limited and temporary suffering, can never afterwards represent a state of unlimited and eternal suffering.

But Gehenna originally signified a state of limited and temporary suffering:

Therefore, Gehenna can never signify a state of unlimited and eternal suffering.

Its counterpart is as follows:—

9—Whatever word originally signified a state of limited and temporary happiness, can never afterwards represent a state of unlimited and eternal happiness.

But Paradise originally signified a state of limited and temporary enjoyment:

Therefore, Paradise can never afterwards represent a state of unlimited and eternal happiness.

But both *Heaven* and *Paradise* are so used in the New Testament.

Digitized by Google

Therefore all these Universalian syllogisms are equally fallacious and delusive.

10—On comparing these four syllogisms, then, ask how much has been gained to the cause of Universalism from all the concessions of all the believers in future punishment; or from all your writings and debates on *sheol*, *hades*, and *gehenna*. This, sir, I wish you to remember is one of my outposts, which I cannot surrender till you bring forces of reason and logic incomparably superior to all that have ever marshalled under your banners. It is, indeed, a rampart in which I feel perfectly impregnable, and I wish to give it conspicuity in the ratio of your efforts to slur it over. I fearlessly conclude, that as the word *heaven* represents a state of future happiness, so the term *hell* as undeniably represents a state of misery after death. So do all the words in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which are now properly translated by them.

11—And here, sir, I am sorry to accuse you of shuffling in a most palpable manner. You change the point most dexterously. You say, "Neither the Hebrew *Shemim*, the Greek *Ouranos*, the Persian *Paradiseos*, nor, I may add, the Latin *Coelum*, nor the English *Heaven*, is ever relied on by any Universalist, nor any other enlightened Christian, as proof of the endless happiness of the saints." That is not the point. The question is not, 'On what words do Universalists rely;' but, Do these words sometimes represent the future happiness of the saints? You, my good sir, have admitted this; and this being by you admitted, is all that is necessary to my parallelism. Why then did you, ingenious sir, change this point into a question about what Universalists choose to rely on in debate. By thus subtilely changing the point, and by conceding that these words do sometimes mean a state of endless happiness, in despite of their original or more common signification, you prove that you are sometimes sufficiently acute; and, moreover, you establish, to my full satisfaction, all that I have alleged about Gehenna.

12—Permit me, sir, to correct your style of address. You are so much accustomed to speak of "wilful perversions" and "outrageous perversions," and to a swelling, declamatory, and highly turgid and boastful manner, that you are not only sinning against human dignity, but misinterpreting the proper language of decency and respect. I now allude to your 7th, 10th, and various other paragraphs, where you declaim on certain terms of modesty, almost to an utter perversion of my meaning. You say that I am "reduced to a mere *probability*," "to a bare *possibility*," "a *perhaps*," that Gehenna was used by our Lord to represent punishment after death. Because I did not in your style, or in that of "His Holiness," say it certainly does so signify, or I have proved it beyond all doubt to signify, &c. &c. but modestly said it is possible, it is probable, &c. But, sir, I think I have proved more than I allege in these words. I wish my arguments to be always a little stronger than my assertions. Yet if you require it of me, I now say that I have fully proved,—

1st. That Gehenna in the New Testament does not represent the valley of Hinnom; but

2d. That it is used by our Lord, not possibly nor probably, but certainly to represent a state of future punishment after death. I assert now the more positively, because we have seen all that you have been able to allege against it. And what is it? That, in the opinion of cer-

Digitized by Google

tain interpreters, it *once* (Matth. v. 22.) refers to burning alive in the literal valley of Hinnom. Then, sir, yourself being judge, we have it eleven times out of twelve the representative not of the valley of Hinnom, but of something more terrible.

13—It is unnecessary for me to contend about Matth. v. 22, as you only urged it upon mere authority. But, sir, were it necessary, I could show that you misinterpret the authors you quote. Of those that I have now leisure to examine, not one of them authorize you or any one else to say that Jesus threatened a literal burning in the valley of Hinnom. They only say that he alluded to this valley, *but meant a future and a different punishment.* You rely too much, sir, upon Mr. Balfour. Jesus never threatened his disciples or his hearers with Jewish punishments for disobedience to his instructions. I have given, some dozen years since, the substance of all these comments, in a note on this passage, in the first edition of my Family Testament.

14—Your cordial admission that to "enter into life" is the contrast of being "cast into hell," and that to "enter into life" is in Scripture style sometimes equivalent to entering heaven or eternal happiness, goes far indeed to justify my remarks in my last letter on Gehenna. But you will have to go a little farther on this point. You take refuge from your own concession that "*to enter into life*" sometimes means to enter into future and eternal bliss—"into immortal beatitude"! by throwing a glorious ambiguity around the phrase "enter into life." But, sir, I must allure you out of the smoke you have thrown around you. To talk of life and of the bread of life, and of passing from death to life, in such a connexion, is supremely rabbinical. You will have "entering into life" sometimes to mean entering into the church! You ask me gravely am I prepared for the issue of my assertion—viz. "that whatever is meant by *entering into life*, the very opposite of that is going into, or being cast into Gehenna?" I answer, *I am.* But why do you immediately fly from the issue by introducing phrases in which the word *life* occurs; such as "bread of *life*," "my words are spirit and *life*," &c. as if these had any thing to do with the contrast before us? Did Jesus contrast "the bread of life" with the "everlasting fire," or with "gehenna," or being "cast into hell"!! You abandon the issue the very moment you dare me to the conflict. I am prepared for the issue, sir, and fearlessly assert that you cannot produce a single instance in the whole Bible where the phrase in issue, viz. "*enter into life*," means to join the church, to become a citizen of Christ's kingdom on earth, or regeneration, or any change of state which happens in this world. You need not parcel out these words and tell me what *life* sometimes means, what *enter* means, and what *into* denotes. No, Mr. Skinner, this is mere trifling. *To be cast into Gehenna* is the phrase with which *enter into life* is contrasted.

15—No one denies that the phrases "kingdom of heaven," "kingdom of God," sometimes mean the church of Christ or Christian institution. No person living, perhaps, has either said or written more on this subject than your humble servant. But that to "enter into life" and to "enter into the kingdom of God," mean the church or Christian institution, in contrast with entering into any other state, is as gratuitous an assumption as you can make. Jesus said to a rich young man, "If you would enter into life, keep the commandments"—"a rich man

Digitized by Google

shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven"—"it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." Do these phrases by any conceivable interpretation mean entering into the church on earth!! If they cannot, in such a connexion, how much less possible or probable that in the contrast with being cast into Gehenna, or the everlasting fire where the worm dieth not, they mean admission into an earthly institution!!

15—Among other delusive questions and assertions, you ask me, paragraph 12th, *If Gehenna have the same meaning in all places*, how are we to understand James speaking of the tongue? &c. Who says that either heaven or hell has the same meaning in all places!! Is this, or is it not, *ad captandum?* I have then, sir, formed the issue. It is with me a strong outpost. That life implies death, that eternal life implies eternal death, that to enter into life in contrast with being cast into hell, means the possession of as great a contrast as reason or language knows: in one word, sir, that in the preaching of Jesus, to be "cast into hell," "into the everlasting fire," as certainly means endless punishment, as to "enter into life" or "into the kingdom of God" does mean endless bliss; and that "to enter into life" does in no place mean to enter into the church or kingdom of God on earth has been shown, and may be most clearly seen by an induction of every passage where the phrase occurs. As I gave all the places where Gehenna occurs, do you give all the places "where enter into life" occurs.

17—I am much abused for an alleged "wilful perversion" of your favorite dogma which I quoted in my last. I have not, sir, wilfully perverted it. You affirm that "justice can neither ask nor receive farther punishment than sincere penitence and reformation." Nay, you go farther and say, that, in this way, "the sinner has been punished according to the full demerit of the crime," &c. Now, sir, if *hell* and *punishment* are two names for the same state; and if justice can demand no greater punishment than repentance, where is the mighty wilful perversion of your dogma in regarding repentance as the only hell or the only state of punishment. If in repentance "the sinner has been punished according to the full demerit of the crime," where shall he find a severer hell than in a penitential heart!! I contend then, sir, that your words amply justify my conclusion. Here I might retort upon you with seven-fold evidence. Why do you coin dogmas for me at the mint of your imagination? Where did you learn that I think that "Adam was threatened with eternal death," &c. &c.? These are fictions of your own manufacture.

18—I protest against such a defence of yourself in any case as you exhibit in the 18th paragraph. You call my exposure of your phantastic or nameless *'version'* of Psalm ix. 17., 'a wilful perversion.' I unequivocally and *ex animo* repel the charge. Except it be your own wilful perversion of reason and truth, there is no other perversion in the passage. You again say, 'The wicked shall experience severe judgments, &c. and *perhaps* also a distressing sense of guilt,' &c. This is your hell with a *perhaps* in the middle of it! Let the reader examine your 18th paragraph, and turn back to my 27th; and after comparing them, I venture to predict he will hereafter understand your 'wilful perversion' to mean your own signal and unanswerable defeat. You talk about my making 'no effort to prove your definition or version

Digitized by Google

to be incorrect'!!! My whole 27th paragraph is given as a perfect disproof of what yourself did not so much as attempt to prove but by the case in debate, as I there told you. Hereafter I advise the reader to look for an unanswerable refutation of your speculation where you talk of 'wilful perversion.' You will be surprised, sir, to find how soon we begin to understand your style. Your 19th paragraph also proves a proposition not now in debate—viz. That it is possible for a person to be ridiculous without being sublime. This, indeed, you proved to a demonstration in the 21st paragraph of the preceding letter, when you made the Roman power 'Him that had power to destroy both soul and body in hell'! Yes, reader, Mr. Skinner's *version* of 'Fear not them that kill the body,' is, 'Might not the Saviour have intended the Roman power?'!!!

19—I have now touched upon all the important points before me, and have formed with you two main issues. These two contain every thing of vital consequence to the discussion of the first proposition. Your 14th paragraph runs out into the second proposition, on the words *everlasting*, *endless*, &c. Still, as the phrase *the everlasting fire* occurred as a substitute for *Gehenna* in my quotations from the four gospels, I must observe that your quotations from the Old Testament are not in point. Not one of them is of the *genus*, much less of the *species* before us. "A fire ever burning upon the altar," or a "smoke ascending forever," are as unlike *to pur to aionion*, *the everlasting fire*, or *to pur to asbeston*, *the unquenchable fire*, as the phrase "bread of life" differs from the phrase "enter into life," or as the phrase "it is truth" differs from "it is *the* truth," or "he is *a* light of the world" differs from "he is *the* light of the world." "*The* everlasting fire" substituted by Jesus for the word "hell," is never found identified with any thing else but hell or future punishment. It is defined by him as "*the everlasting fire* prepared for the devil and his angels." Matth. xxv. 41. *You cannot produce a single instance in the whole New Testament wherein it is applied to any thing temporal or limited!* Take notice, I have given you the chance of an issue on the second proposition. My dear sir, there is the width of the poles between saying 'Thou art *a* man,' and 'Thou art *the* man'—between *a fire that ever burns* on my hearth, and 'the everlasting fire.' I beseech you to abandon your loose style of quoting scripture. No man ever can arrive at *the truth* who interprets and applies words regardless of their adjuncts.

20—Universalists believe that 'Adam did die the very death threatened, on the *very day* of transgression.' They believe many other strange things. I believe that Adam died at the end of NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS after his creation, and that this was threatened in the words, 'In the day thou eatest thereof DYING THOU SHALT DIE.' But of all these curious matters in their own place.

21—What the Apostles preached to the Gentiles will also appear in the sequel. That they preached fearful vengeance, future punishment, punishment after death, everlasting ruin to wicked men, to those who rejected the Messiah, is awfully certain. Yes, sir, you will as soon quench the orb of day by your spittle, as quench the everlasting fire of Heaven's insulted Majesty, by all your powers of reason and declamation.

22—You admit there has been PUNISHMENT for sin—punishment

Digitized by Google

issuing in the destruction of sinners. Of these admissions, hereafter. You pass too lightly over many things in my last epistle, No. VI. The 17th, 21st, 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, 28th, and 31st paragraphs have been either leaped over, or trod on as burning embers.

23—That the Scribes and Pharisees, addressed by Jesus as an offspring of vipers, were cast into the hell of Jerusalem's destruction, is as baseless, wretched, miserable, blind, and naked a *get-off* from a dilemma, as, in my opinion, can be found in universal history. These Scribes and Pharisees, so ripe in wickedness, could not be less than 40 or 50 years old when Jesus was 33. They had seen their fourscore years and more before Titus, A. D. 70, besieged the city; and if they did not escape that damnation of hell, must, in at least nine cases in ten, have been raised from the dead!

24—Your reply to this letter, if it reach me not before the 22d inst., will not find me at home. I shall be gone to Ohio for two weeks or more. In case it should not arrive in time, I will leave a letter on the 2d proposition, to follow your next, and shall attend to your reply to this on my return. This will be forwarded in *proof* by our mail of the 3d instant.

In all benevolence, your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE following remarks from Elder SPENCER H. CONE, of New York, President of the late anniversary meeting of the American and Foreign Bible Society, are judicious and interesting. Some who now receive these details with acclamation because of the source whence they emanate, repudiated us for making similar statements—partly in the very same words, and all substantially the same in sense, in our defence of the new version which we issued some twelve years ago. True, indeed, there is one assertion in the following remarks from which we must dissent—'that the scriptures claim for every jot and tittle of themselves the same plenary and verbal inspiration.' This we regard as ultraism. Mr. Cone can, in our judgment, adduce no proof of any such claim: and could it be substantiated, would greatly impair the reasonings of the most able defenders of the inspiration of the Bible. It would be a great reproach upon the four Evangelists to represent them as believing every jot and tittle of the words of the Messiah and of themselves to have been inspired, when not any two of them narrate the same parable, conversation, sermon, or aphorism in the same words. The ideas and leading terms that represent them may be so regarded, but not every jot and tittle. But as the gentleman does not appear to have gravely weighed this assertion, we will not farther expose it. A. C.

Digitized by Google

ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE President, *Spencer H. Cone*, of New York, took the chair, at 7, P. M.; and, after the introductory exercises, addressed the meeting:—

Brethren and Friends—The occasion which has convened us is one of surpassing interest. Borne along by circumstances which we could neither anticipate nor control, cut off from resources upon which we had been accustomed, perhaps, too much to rely, and having examined the signs of the times with prayerful solicitude, we have at length been constrained to organize a distinct society for the printing and circulation of the sacred scriptures. To this course we have been impelled, not merely by the fact that the Calcutta, the British & Foreign, and the American Bible Societies have combined in the determination to afford no further aid to versions made by Baptist missionaries—*versions which obvious duty binds us promptly and adequately to sustain*,—but the measure has been imperatively demanded by the cry of the destitute, by the ardent desire of many of our churches to come up to the help of the Lord, in this matter, against the mighty, and by the peculiar facilities now afforded us in the glorious work of Bible distribution.

In communicating to the human family the gracious plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, *holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. Not only did they deliver the *sentiments*, but the *very words* of Jehovah. The sacred penmen were no more left to their own wisdom in the selection and arrangement of sentences, than in the choice of the facts or doctrines, the promises or threatenings, they should at any time promulgate. Much has been said by the learned about the different degrees and kinds of inspiration pertaining to different portions of the Bible; but as these speculations are never based upon a *thus saith the Lord*, the conclusion is inevitable that they are wise above what is written. The scriptures claim for every jot and tittle of themselves, the same plenary and verbal inspiration. ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD! He breathed into the writers the *lively oracles;* and whether the *words of the Lord* were spoken by the mouth of his servant David, whether his messages were confined to Prophets or Apostles, and whether they comprehended the import of their own annunciations or not, *they all spake as the Spirit gave them utterance*. If this reasoning be not conclusive, it is evident that we need a *second* revelation, by which to ascertain what portion of the *first* is the word of God.

The gift of inspiration, it is true, is not vouchsafed to modern missionaries and translators; nevertheless, in connexion with

Digitized by Google

their high vocation, the doctrine we advocate is of immense moment. Under its influence, not a single word can be intentionally neglected, obscured, or perverted; but giving themselves to diligent study, and to fervent prayer, "they will make it their sole aim to present to the nations the word of life, in its nearest approach to the mind of God, contained in the original record."

Among the errors and frauds which have marked the rise and progress of the Papal hierarchy, *handling the word of the Lord deceitfully* certainly is not the least. To keep back any part of the price, *to add to, or take from, the words of the Book*, is a crime of no questionable character—the curse of the Almighty rests upon it! The Romish priesthood have always withheld the scriptures from the laity as far as practicable; and when this could no longer be done, their effort has been to *obscure* the light of divine truth, and to incorporate with their several translations the distinguishing dogmas of their religion. In the accomplishment of this object, the *transferring* of Greek terms, instead of *translating* them, has proved to be a most successful device. The hollow pretext for this conduct has been, that they were ecclesiastical or sacred words, invested with a certain mysterious meaning, which could not be appropriately and fully expressed in other tongues. Hence, in the English Testament, prepared by the Jesuits of Rheims, in 1582, we find *paraseeve, azymes, neophite, pasche, tunike, holocaust*, and a multitude of others, Greek words, in Roman letters, with English terminations, "introduced, not with the desire of sincerity, but rather of obscurity, *so that their translation needed to be translated over again*," as Fuller the historian has long since observed.

We cannot but deeply deplore the effect of this system, in perverting the ordinance of baptism, and establishing in its place, to a wide extent, *infant sprinkling*, which the learned and venerable Gill has justly called "*a part and pillar of Popery.*" The history of this perversion is exceedingly plain. The church of Rome decreed that the Latin translation revised by Jerome, usually called the Vulgate, should be the *infallible standard* of divine truth. It was published by Pope Sixtus V., with many alterations, and the seal of *infallibility* was affixed to his edition. His successor, Pope Clement VIII., however, suppressed it, as swarming with errors, and brought out another *infallible standard*, differing from the former in more than two thousand instances! And yet, even in this expurgated edition, false renderings, both numerous and gross, have been pointed out by those profound scholars and theologians, Cartwright and Fulke, in their refutation of the Rhemish Testament, who confidently assert, "that, compared with the authentical Greek text, it is in many places ridiculous, insincere, untrue; and consequently of

Digitized by Google

no authority, much less majesty." In this version, used by Papists, for the maintenance of their "*prodigious structure of imposture and wickedness*," baptizo and its cognates are invariably *Latinized—never translated*; and the same policy was pursued in all European versions, wherever the authority of the "Man of Sin" prevailed. The unlearned, not being permitted to read in their own tongues, wherein they were born, what God required of believers, were compelled to rely upon their spiritual guides, and they told them that baptizo signified to sprinkle, or pour, or christen—that it was *too holy to be translated*—and that its meaning was immaterial as it was indefinite. And so, UNHAPPILY, one of the important ordinances of the gospel, described by the Holy Spirit as with a sunbeam, has been covered up and hid from the mass of the people, by THE POPISH ARTIFICE OF TRANSFER!

The Baptists, in every age and in every clime, from the days of Paul, when the sect was everywhere spoken against, to the present hour, have been the steadfast friends of the VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE, in whatever pertains to religion. They maintain, to use the language of a forcible writer, "that man cannot be born into a system of faith, nor be surrendered in infancy or age to a form of religion, but may assert his right to judge for himself—to examine and decide under the lofty conviction that God has not made him a slave—to acknowledge no clerical or secular domination, but scorn, with becoming indignation, every attempt to subdue reason by enforcing the dogmas of a party, and hold, with determined fidelity, the high vantage-ground assigned them by their Creator." No man is born a Baptist. Membership in our churches is matter of choice, after the Christian character is formed.

The *compulsory system*, which tramples upon the freedom of judgment and will, is written in the history of our denomination in characters of blood. The Baptists in the valleys of Piedmont, in Germany, Bohemia, France, Wales, and New England, have been the subjects of the most unrelenting persecutions They were fined, imprisoned, banished, and massacred—not upon the principle of retaliation, because they had persecuted others; not for any immoralities laid to their charge; but because they immersed willing converts, and opposed the baptism of unwilling infants, and refused for doctrine the commandments of men, and adhered, with unyielding integrity, to the great Bible principle, LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, THE INALIENABLE BIRTHRIGHT OF MAN! Attachment to this sentiment has resulted in our separation from the American Bible Society. The Managers of that institution interfered with the *consciences* of Baptist missionaries, in the execution of their trust as translators of God's holy book; requiring

Digitized by Google

them to make versions that might be consistently used by the several denominations composing the Society, *as the indispensable condition of future patronage.* Believing that "the Bible should control human opinions, and that the creeds of different sects ought never to govern the Bible," we have disallowed the rule adopted by the A. B. S., and, *ceasing from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, would lift up our eyes to the hills whence our strength cometh.* The brethren in England, placed in similar circumstances, have presented a protest (signed by five hundred and forty-four Baptist ministers) to the British and Foreign Bible Society, remonstrating against the *sectarian resolution* of that institution, which refuses aid to brother Yates' improved version of the Bengalee New Testament.

Our missionaries, in the mean time, are pursuing the "even tenor of their way," and continue, with untiring zeal, to deliver to the heathen, with all attainable accuracy, the unadulterated word of truth. To sustain them in their work of faith and labor of love, and to circulate, according to its ability, the most faithful versions of the Scriptures that can be procured, that sinners may be saved and God glorified, is the single object of the American and Foreign Bible Society. "The Lord bless your new institution," is the prayer of Pearce; "may all the American Baptists aid its funds, and entreat for it God's blessing; and may British Baptists follow your example!"

In the commencement of our enterprize, we have much reason *to thank God and take courage.* Our hearts are cheered by the countenances of the brethren, and the lines have fallen to us in pleasant places. We dwell in the land where Roger Williams first recognized the broad principle of religious liberty in connexion with civil government—a principle which has since become an essential feature in the noble institutions of these confederated States. America is the land of the Baptists. Here are no courts of inquisition, nor acts of uniformity; no union of church and state, nor sword of the magistrate in the hand of religious despotism! We can preach as we print, and print as we preach, and have none to make us afraid.

In the prosecution of our work, we know too much of men and things not to expect disappointments and difficulties; but we also know that "faith is given to be tried, and difficulties are created to be overcome." Our reliance for strength to draw the sword, and for skill to aim aright, is placed alone upon the God of the Bible; and should he condescend to smile upon our endeavors, the *name* of our Society will fitly describe *the field* of its future operations. But the Corresponding Secretary has prepared a detailed report of the operations of the Society, and I will no longer detain you from the pleasure and information which that

Digitized by Google

document is calculated to impart. Permit me, in conclusion, only to say, that we have acted in all this matter from the deep and abiding conviction that THE FAITHFUL AND TRUE WITNESS called us to engage in this great and good work; and we bless his holy name, that, in the midst of considerations most delicate and embarrassing, He condescended to afford us light and fortitude promptly to commence and steadily to prosecute it; and we deem it no presumption to hope that it will be remembered with gratitude by millions, when the deaf shall hear the words of the Book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity. And now we humbly entreat thee, O Lord our God, satisfy us early with thy mercy, and make us glad according to the years wherein we have seen evil! Let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children; and let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us! Yea, the work of our hands, establish thou it!

N. Y. Baptist Register.

From the New York Observer.

THE IRISH CATHOLIC CLERGY.

WE copy from the London Christian Guardian, the following summary statement of the proofs on which the Protestants of Great Britain rely in support of their charge of intolerance in the doctrines of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy.

The committee of the Protestant Association have just published an important address to the people of England, in which, after a suitable introduction, they most clearly establish *certain facts* as to the Irish Roman clergy.

First, as to the publication of an authorized edition of the Bible, with notes, bearing the highest Episcopal sanction.

Second, as to the adoption and approval of a system of theology, by the Roman bishops, for the "secure guidance" of their clergy.

Third, as to the annexation to that system of theology, of a supplementary volume.

1. The publication of a quarto edition of the Bible, with the Rhemish notes, bearing the sanction and recommendation of several prelates of the Romish church, commenced in Dublin, in 1813, and was completed in 1816, and another edition was brought out at Cork, in 1817–18. The following facts relating to this work, appear now to be admitted on all hands:—

(1.) That the Bible in question was undertaken by a Romish bookseller, of the name of Macnamara, in 1813, and announced by him as appearing under the patronage of Dr. O'Reilly, R. C.

Digitized by Google

Archbishop of Armagh; Dr. Troy, R. C. Archbishop of Dublin; Dr. Murray, R. C. Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin; five other Roman Catholic bishops; many other dignitaries, and nearly three hundred Roman Catholic clergymen.

(2.) That the Rev. P. A. Walsh, Roman Catholic minister of Denmark street chapel, in Dublin, was deputed by Dr. Troy to *revise* the said notes—did actually so revise them—and was paid by the publisher for performing that duty.

(3.) That, after these notes had been so revised and so published, this Bible was put into circulation among these eight Roman Catholic bishops, and three hundred clergy, and other subscribers, and remained in their hands till October, 1817; that is, as to the whole Bible, above a year, and as to the larger part of it (being issued in numbers) above two years, without a single objection being offered to the notes by any one, either of the eight bishops, the three hundred priests, or even the Roman Catholic laity who had become subscribers.

(4.) That the character of these notes appended to this Bible, having, after some time, been noticed by the London "*British Critic*," Dr. Troy did then, in October, 1817, publish a disclaimer of the work. His reason, however, for so disclaiming it, he afterwards stated to Coyne, the publisher, to be, "That very bad consequences had followed the publication; that, finding its way into England, it had armed our enemies against us, and this at a time when we were seeking emancipation;" reasons, obviously, which were grounded upon *policy*, and not on *principle*.

(5.) That Mr. O'Connel proposed to the Roman Catholic laity a public denunciation of these notes; and procured the appointment of a committee to draw up such denunciation, which committee met on several occasions, and repeatedly obtained further time, till at last, at a distance of eighteen days from the introduction of the subject, the Board was permitted to dissolve without agreeing to any denunciation whatever.

(6.) That another edition was published in Cork, bearing the date of 1810, but being, it is most probable, actually in press in 1817, during all this talk about a denunciation; which edition was announced to be brought out under the patronage of twelve Roman Catholic bishops, one hundred and twenty-five priests, and, in all, 1827 subscribers of various degrees. And this Bible is now found in daily use in many of the houses of Roman Catholics in all parts of Ireland at the present moment.

The real character of these notes appears from the following specimens:—

Matt. xiii. 29, 30. (*Lest while.*)—"The good must tolerate the evil, when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole church, and commit the

Digitized by Google

matter to God's judgment in the latter day; otherwise, where ill men, be they heretics or other malefactors, may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastened or executed."

Luke ix. 55. (*He rebuked them.*) "Not justice, nor all rigorous punishment of sinners, is here forbidden, nor Elias' fact reprehended, nor the church or Christian princes blamed for putting heretics to death; but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion, and regard of their amendment, and example to others. Therefore St. Peter used his power upon Ananias and Sapphira, when he struck them both down to death for defrauding the church."

Luke xiv. 23. (*Compel them.*)—"The vehement persuasion that God useth, both externally by the force of his word and miracles, and internally by his grace, to bring us unto him against our own wills, but that he can alter and modify a hard heart, and make him willing that before would not. St. Augustine also referreth this compelling to the penal laws which Catholic princes do justly use against heretics and schismatics; proving that they who are by their professions in baptism subject to the Catholic church, are departed from the same after sects, may and ought to be compelled into the unity and society of the universal church again."

Acts xxv. (*I appeal unto Cesar.*)—"If St. Paul, both to save himself from whipping and from death sought by the Jews, doubted not to claim succor from the Roman laws, and to appeal to Cesar, the Prince of the Romans, not yet christened, how much more may we call for the aid of Christian princes and their laws, for the punishment of heresies, and for the church's defence against them."

2 Cor. x. 6. (*To revenge.*)—"You may see hereby, that the spiritual power of bishops is not only preaching the gospel, and so by persuasion and exhortation only (as some heretics hold) to remit or retain sins, but that it hath authority to punish, judge, and condemn heretics and other like rebels; which power one of the principal rebels (Calvin) of this time, being convicted by the evidence of the place, acknowledgeth to be grounded upon Christ's words. "Whatever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." Matth. xvii. 18. Apply, also, the words to Jer. i. 10: "Behold, I appoint thee over nations and kingdoms, that thou plant, pluck up, build, and destroy;" to confirm and explain the power apostolic here alleged by St. Paul. Nay, they would gladly draw this power from the lawful successors of the Apostles to themselves—their ministers and consistories—which are nothing else but the shops and councils of sedition, and all the

Digitized by Google

conspirations of this time against the lawful princes of the world."

Rev. ii. 20. (*Because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel.*)—"He warneth bishops to be zealous and stout against false prophets and heretics of what sort soever, by alluding covertly to the example of holy Elias, that in zeal killed four hundred and fifty false prophets of Jezebel, and spared not Ahab nor Jezebel themselves, but told them to their faces that they troubled Israel, that is, the faithful people of God."

Rev. xvii. 6. (*Drunk with blood.*)—"It is plain that this woman signifieth the whole body of all the persecutors that have, and shall, shed so much blood of the just, of the prophets, apostles, and other martyrs, from the beginning of the world to the end. The Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that there they put heretics to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries; but their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."

Such are the doctrines actually disseminated in the years 1813 to 1818, in the two chief cities of Ireland, with the appended sanction of ten or twelve prelates of the Romish church, and of three or four hundred of the priests! The excuse now made, is, that they did not know that *those* notes were to be published, and that their approbation was given under a mistake or misapprehension. But it is then very naturally inquired, whether a Roman Catholic priest of Dublin had not been specially selected and appointed by Dr. Troy, to examine and approve the notes so appended? The answer made, is, that though so appointed by his archbishop, and though paid for his labor by the publisher, he did not, in fact, execute faithfully what he was employed and paid to do! But, then, another question remains, namely: How came such notes as these to be in circulation among eight bishops and a great body of the priests, for one year, or nearly two, without a word of expostulation or disapproval being heard from any quarter, till a London Protestant review had brought their enormity to light? To this question no answer whatever has been given. And this is the case of the Rhemish notes.

Mr. LYND ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

[CONCLUDED.

"If," says my friend Mr. Lynd, "all the influence of the Holy Spirit is in the words recorded in the Old and New Testament, and we have these in our possession, why pray for grace to help

Digitized by Google

in time of need?" This is a dogma I never believed. I never said nor wrote that "*all the influence* of the Holy Spirit is in the words," &c. But as Mr. Lynd did not intend to misrepresent me, it is probable he meant that we taught that all the illuminating or sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit is in the word, &c. Then the question ought to be, If all the illuminating sanctifying influence, &c. To which in reply I would ask, If all the vegetating and animalizing power of the Creator is now in the universe, operating in immutable laws, why pray to God for fruitful seasons? or, with Paul, for the multiplication of the seed sown and an abundant harvest, &c.? Mr. Lynd's answer to this question will be my answer to his question. He will not say that God should create more heat or more moisture, or new and different laws of nature; but that he would so direct and govern the whole machinery of the seasons, or operations of nature, as to insure seed to the sower and bread to the eater. So when I pray for the conversion of sinners, or the sanctification of the disciples of Christ, I ask not for any new light or revelation from the Holy Spirit; but that God would so order it in his ten thousand ways and means, that the word of life, the gospel, might have access to their hearts and work in them to will and do according to his benevolence.

Again—'grace to help in every time of need' means more than simple illumination, conviction, conversion. We need to be either delivered from various temptations or to be strengthened and sustained under them. When the Lord said to Paul, "My grace shall be sufficient for you, and my strength shall be perfected in your weakness," neither illumination nor justification, neither sanctification nor adoption was promised, but assistance to withstand a messenger of Satan, and to endure a thorn in the flesh. For all such aids I thank the Lord we are encouraged to pray, and to come to the throne of grace, believing that we shall obtain seasonable help.

But the main point and the strong point of confutation, in Mr. Lynd's judgment, is a passage quoted from an essay on spiritual influence, in which we teach that "the Holy Spirit is, or may be sometimes necessary to keep in mind revelations given, or to bring the word written seasonably to our remembrance."

Digitized by Google

Mr. Lynd asks, "By what kind of influence is this done? Is it *physical?* is it *moral?* or is it *supernatural?*" Here again it seems we agree in the fact; and what matters it how we designate this influence! But as it is ecclessiastically criminal to misname this peculiar influence, we must religiously consider it. I have already shown that to call it *mediatorial* or *supernatural* power, helps our conceptions not so much as the shadow of an idea. *Supernatural* may designate the power as to its source, but reaches not its nature. Well, then, it is either physical or moral, or mixed. But Mr. Lynd has repudiated pure physical power, and therefore he needs as much help as myself to explain this singular operation. Perhaps we may assist one another to dispose of this hitherto insuperable difficulty in the way of all speculative Christians. I shall then contribute my mite and bring up a case which may furnish some data. How, then, do parents and teachers fix the attention and aid the recollections of their children and pupils? How many ways may the attention be won without any physical influence upon either body or mind? And in how many ways by suggestions and various associations may ideas be revived and former impressions recalled without any direct impulse? Dr. Beattie, it is said, by writing the name of his son, yet in his 5th year, in a bed in his garden, and sowing it with sallad, occasioned in his mind a train of reflections that issued in his conviction of the existence and superintending care of God; and yet he did not directly operate either physically or morally upon his mind. He only *occasioned* a train of reflections that thus eventuated. And who is it that has paid much attention to the training of children, who has not found out various ways and means of reviving the recollections of former impressions without speaking a single word or operating directly upon the faculties of the subject? I have seen lads at school who had learned to prompt their companions by signs; and who, without even whispering a word, could assist the memory of other classmates in recalling a particular word or thought with the most singular accuracy.

Now if children in a few years can acquire such insight into the minds of their associates as to make suggestions and revive former impressions, by a sign or a circumstance not even stipu-

Digitized by Google

lated, what shall we say of angelic power or of the power of God's Spirit in occasioning trains of thought, arresting the attention, and holding up certain associations in the mind by means of media so subtle and indiscoverable that one seems to think, feel, and act as spontaneously as though there was no other agency in the universe than their own. Still, however, the power that operates upon the human mind is the power of argument or motive: for the holding the picture to the eye, the word to the ear, or the recalling by any circumstances an old idea, or even the suggestion of a new one, does not constitute a new sort of power so far as the nature of the influence upon the mind is concerned. Commanding or constraining the attention seems to be the great matter. Fixing the mind upon the truth is the same as fixing the truth upon the mind. "The Lord opened the heart of Lydia that she *attended* to the words of Paul." She was a pious worshipper of God before she heard Paul. But by some means her attention was called to Paul's preaching, and she believed the gospel and was baptized.

This power of circumstances, we, in other matters, call *providential*; because the train is either laid, or it is overruled by the Lord. Still the power is either physical or moral: for providential, like supernatural, or mediatorial, reaches not the nature of the influence. And surely if we admit that our persons, families and property are objects worthy of the providential regard of Heaven, our souls and their interests and destiny are still more worthy objects of his concern. Yet as it is in the daily providences of our heavenly Father no new miracles are wrought, no new laws or impulses are created; so in the spiritual economy there can be no new revelation, miraculous impulses, or new laws or operations instituted.

My having been born at a particular time, of particular parents, in a Christian land; my having been religiously educated and placed in the centre of a thousand favorable circumstances, are events for which I constantly thank my God; and, of course I regard them all as *personal* favors. In like manner, that my attention has been called to his oracles, and that his word has had an abiding in my heart, and that it exerts a sanctifying influence on my whole moral frame and its appendages, are matters

Digitized by Google

for which I bless the Lord as I do for my existence. All these are tokens of his grace, and matters of ceaseless gratitude and praise. I also pray for the hand of the Lord to preserve my person, family, property, from all dangers and disasters; to bless all my labors; to protect me and mine from fire, and flood, and tempest; and from the ten thousand ills and dangers of this world. The same blessings I crave for the household of faith, all friends and benefactors, as well as forgiveness for my enemies. But this is not all: I pray that God's Holy Spirit may dwell in my heart; that God may create in me a pure heart and renew within me a right spirit; that he would strengthen, confirm, and comfort me always; that he would sanctify me wholly; and that my whole person, "the spirit, the soul, the body, may be preserved unblameable to the coming of the Lord Jesus."——Now in all this I expect nothing to be done for me miraculously, but by the use of means. I guard against every danger and turn away from all seeming peril. I make use of all means to preserve health, life, property, &c. and to increase knowledge, faith, love, hope, joy, &c. I have constant respect to all the ordinances of God. I do not shut my eyes and ask God to guide me. I do not run into the face of danger, and ask the Lord to preserve me; nor do I pray for his Spirit to teach and sanctify me, without my reading, searching, and constantly studying his Book. I expect not the Lord to bless my indolence or negligence; nor to do any thing for me, but by my doing all I can for myself. It is with me, then, the providence or the grace of God in every thing. With David most cheerfully I will say, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." It is the Lord who giveth life, health, and talent, and power to do any thing that is good for body, soul, or estate.

We are not, then, opposed in thought, word, or action to a spiritual religion: nay, indeed, it is for this religion, and for this only, we contend. We are of opinion that doctrines concerning the Holy Spirit are taught both dishonorable to God and pernicious to society. We oppose these errors as we judge: but in opposing these, he that imagines that we oppose the things that have been so abused and perverted to the ruin of many, and to the disgrace of our religion, greatly errs.

Digitized by Google

The speculations upon spiritual operations are, in my judgment, unprofitable. Men lose the Spirit of God in contending about it, as well as *falsely* accuse one another while fighting for *truth!* If I had not found multitudes of converted unbelievers, ignorant and unsanctified subjects of special outpourings of the Spirit; if I had not met with a thousand marvellous tales of miraculous conversions by new or special illuminations, appearances, visions, dreams, that left the soul as dark as midnight and the heart as cold as ice as regards the religion of the Son of God; if I had not met with many preachers that regarded themselves miraculously called and sent to preach Christ's gospel, almost as ignorant of the Bible as they were of the Koran, telling incredible tales of what the Lord had done for them, when they could scarcely tell where the Messiah was born, or why it behooved him to die and rise again: I say, if I had not met with multitudes thus deceived and deceiving others about spiritual operations, I should never have had any controversy on this subject.

I regret, indeed, to see so little of the fruits of the Holy Spirit, and to hear so few desires expressed for his presence and power in the hearts and lives of the professed followers of Christ. If any man have not the Spirit of God abiding in him, he has no spiritual life; his body is not a temple of the Holy One; God does not dwell in him, and he is unfit for the spiritual joys and bliss of heaven.

I hear too many prayers for the Spirit of God to convert the people as on Pentecost, to baptize them in fire, and to compel them by irresistible grace or power to believe and obey the gospel, &c. These savor not of the New Testament, but of a more recent and mystic theology. The word of the Lord ought to be preached much more, and the opinions of men much less; and men called upon to repent, believe, and be baptized, that they may enjoy the love of God and the consolations of his Spirit, and go on to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord.

Friend Beebee, of the "New York Baptist Register," has charged me with being a schismatic, and has not yet let his readers, so far as I can see, hear my defence; and, if I mistake not, he is an advocate of free discussion—a *Protestant*—one that opposes popery and priestcraft—a candid, fair, and magnanimous journalist. Do, then, Mr. Beebee, act worthy of yourself.

Digitized by Google

I will thank Mr. Lynd to have my defence laid before his readers; and if I am not yet satisfactory to him, I will be still more explicit so soon as I learn from him *what lack I yet.* I will thank him to contribute as much to our edification as I have for his on the present occasion. I know he is a *Protestant*, and goes for free discussion. A. C.

ANY CHRISTIANS AMONG PROTESTANT PARTIES.

"*Lunenburg, July 8th*, 1837.

"*Dear brother Campbell*—I was much surprised to-day, while reading the Harbinger, to see that you recognize the Protestant parties as Christian. You say, you 'find in all Protestant parties Christians.'

"Dear brother, my surprize and ardent desire to do what is right, prompt me to write to you at this time. I feel well assured, from the estimate you place on the female character, that you will attend to my feeble questions in search of knowledge.

"Will you be so good as to let me know how any one becomes a Christian? What act of yours gave you the name of Christian? At what time had Paul the name of Christ called on him? At what time did Cornelius have Christ named on him? Is it not through this name we obtain eternal life? Does the name of Christ or Christian belong to any but those who believe the *gospel*, repent, and are buried by baptism into the death of Christ?"

In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the *everlasting* kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the *gates of hell have prevailed against his church!* This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.

But who is a Christian? I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will. *A perfect man in Christ*, or a perfect Christian, is one thing; and "a babe in Christ," a stripling in the faith, or an imperfect Christian, is another. The New Testament recognizes both the perfect man and the imperfect man in Christ. The former, indeed, implies the latter. Paul commands the imperfect Christians to "*be perfect*," (2 Cor. iii. 11.) and says he wishes the perfection of Chris-

Digitized by Google

tians. "And this also we wish" for you *saints* in Corinth, "even your perfection:" and again he says, "We speak wisdom among the perfect," (1 Cor. ii. 6.) and he commands them to be "perfect in understanding," (1 Cor. xiv. 20.) and in many other places implies or speaks the same things. Now there is perfection of will, of temper, and of behaviour. There is a perfect state and a perfect character. And hence it is possible for Christians to be imperfect in some respects without an absolute forfeiture of the Christian state and character. Paul speaks of "carnal" Christians, of "weak" and "strong" Christians; and the Lord Jesus admits that some of the good and honest-hearted bring forth only thirty fold, while others bring forth sixty, and some a hundred fold increase of the fruits of righteousness.

But every one is wont to condemn others in that in which he is more intelligent than they; while, on the other hand, he is condemned for his Pharisaism or his immodesty and rash judgment of others, by those that excel in the things in which he is deficient. I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven. "Salvation was of the Jews," acknowledged the Messiah; and yet he said of a foreigner, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, a Syro-Phenician, "I have not found so great faith—no, not in Israel."

Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually-minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians. Still I will be asked, How do I know that any one loves my Master but by his obedience to his commandments? I answer, *In no other way*. But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedobaptist more spiritually-minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known.

With me mistakes of the understanding and errors of the affections are not to be confounded. They are as distant as the poles. An ange

Digitized by Google

may mistake the meaning of a commandment, but he will obey it in the sense in which he understands it. John Bunyan and John Newton were very different persons, and had very different views of baptism, and of some other things; yet they were both disposed to obey, and to the extent of their knowledge did obey the Lord in every thing.

There are mistakes with, and without depravity. There are wilful errors which all the world must condemn, and unavoidable mistakes which every one will pity. The Apostles mistook the Saviour when he said concerning John, "What if I will that John tarry till I come;" but the Jews perverted his words when they alleged that Abraham had died, in proof that he spake falsely when he said, "If a man keep my word he shall never see death."

Many a good man has been mistaken. Mistakes are to be regarded as culpable and as declarative of a corrupt heart only when they proceed from a wilful neglect of the means of knowing what is commanded. Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary. Now, unless I could prove that all who neglect the positive institutions of Christ and have substituted for them something else of human authority, do it knowingly, or, if not knowingly, are voluntarily ignorant of what is written, I could not, I dare not say that their mistakes are such as unchristianize all their professions.

True, indeed, that it is always a misfortune to be ignorant of any thing in the Bible, and very generally it is criminal. But how many are there who cannot read; and of those who can read, how many are so deficient in education; and of those educated, how many are ruled by the authority of those whom they regard as superiors in knowledge and piety, that they never can escape out of the dust and smoke of their own chimney, where they happened to be born and educated! These all suffer many privations and many perplexities, from which the more intelligent are exempt.

The preachers of "*essentials*," as well as the preachers of "*non-essentials*," frequently err. The Essentialist may disparage the heart, while the Non-essentialist despises the institution. The latter makes void the institutions of Heaven, while the former appreciates not the mental bias on which God looketh most. My correspondent may belong to a class who think that we detract from the authority and value of an institution the moment we admit the bare possibility of any one being saved without it. But we choose rather to associate with those who think that they do not undervalue either seeing or hearing, by affirming that neither of them, nor both of them together, are essential to life. I would not sell one of my eyes for all the gold on earth; yet I could live without it.

Digitized by Google

There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian—though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort. My right hand and my right eye are greatly essential to my usefulness and happiness, but not to my life; and as I could not be a perfect man without them, so I cannot be a perfect Christian without a right understanding and a cordial reception of immersion in its true and scriptural meaning and design. But he that thence infers that none are Christians but the immersed, as greatly errs as he who affirms that none are alive but those of clear and full vision.

I do not formally answer all the queries proposed, knowing the one point to which they all aim. To that point only I direct these remarks. And while I would unhesitatingly say, that I think that every man who despises any ordinance of Christ, or who is willingly ignorant of it, cannot be a Christian; still I should sin against my own convictions, should I teach any one to think that if he mistook the meaning of any institution, while in his soul he desired to know the whole will of God, he must perish forever. But to conclude for the present—he that claims for himself a license to neglect the least of all the commandments of Jesus, because it is possible for some to be saved, who, through insuperable ignorance or involuntary mistake, do neglect or transgress it; or he that wilfully neglects to ascertain the will of the Lord to the whole extent of his means and opportunities, because some who are defective in that knowledge may be Christians, is not possessed of the spirit of Christ, and cannot be registered among the Lord's people. So I reason; and I think in so reasoning I am sustained by all the Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments. A. C.

Prophetic Department.

THE PROPHECIES—*NO. VII.*

Having taken a miniature view of the prophecies of the first two thousand four hundred years of the world, as they are comprehensively viewed—1st. In the prophetic threatening delivered to the serpent—2d. In the prospective blessing and curse uttered by Noah to his three sons—3d. In the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, concerning the seed—4th. In Jacob's benedictions on his son Judah—5th. In Balaam's oracles concerning the Star of Jacob and the Sceptre of Israel, together with the destinies of Israel to the end of the Roman Captivity

Digitized by Google

—And, 6th. In the Mosaic premonitions concerning the great Prophet, and the afflictions and distresses of the disobedient Jews—we are about to open a new chapter, and enter upon new studies in the sacred volumes of the past, for the sake of data for the opening the seals of the vision and prophecy of gospel times; and in the present article we shall look in the face of a *typical* person—a prophetic man, called Jehoshea or Jesus.

Moses died in the wilderness. Joshua succeeds him, not as a law-giver, but as a General. Moses laid his hands upon him, and the Spirit of God had fallen upon him. The Strength of Israel pledged himself to Joshua as his strength and his support. He found Israel where Moses left them—Jordan laying before them, between them and Canaan, and the wilderness in their rear. Seven idolatrous nations then occupied the covenanted land of Immanuel. From the most renowned of these, the Canaanites, "*the Land of Promise*" had its name.

Both Egypt and Canaan in the days of Moses were peopled with the sons of Ham. The Phenicians or Tyrians, or Carthagenians, as they are occasionally denominated, sprang from the same root; and although this land originally belonged to Shem and was first peopled by his descendants, even as early as the days of Abraham the Canaanites possessed it.

This picturesque and prophetic land, originally the property of Shem, being seized by the sons of Ham and named from his son Canaan, was also known by other names. From the Philistines that occupied the sea-coasts of it, whose name was corrupted into the *Palastines*, the country was frequently called *Palestine*. It was also called "the Land of Israel;" and from the Jews, or Judah, it was called Judea: but, because of the covenant which guarantied it to Abraham and his seed, it is in sacred style once called "*the Land of Promise*."

To conduct, as a Captain-General, the Israelites into this country, and to divide it amongst them, was the peculiar office of Joshua the son of Nun. The law, or Moses, led them only to Jordan, the sign of death; but *Jehoshea*, or the Divine Saviour, leads them to the promised rest, and distributes among them the covenanted inheritance.

Nothing can be more splendid in the department of conquest than the wars of Joshua. At the head of sixty myriads, guided by the finger of God, and led on by the ark of the immutable covenant, he began his march. Jordan stood aghast at his approach. So soon as the shadow of the sacred ark fell upon its waters, and the Priests that bare it baptized their feet in the edge of the stream which then overflowed its banks, the waters trembled and were severed, so that Jordan fled away backward, and left its naked channel for the chosen tribes to march

Digitized by Google

through. The ark-bearing Priests stand in the midst of the river forming a defile and a palladium, in the presence of whom the two millions of Israel pass in solemn and silent majesty. Twelve stones are borne on the shoulders of twelve chosen Israelites, selected from each of the sons of Jacob, from which to erect a monument to the God of Abraham and a memento to future generations of the place where Israel forded the river.

They crossed immediately opposite to Jericho; and soon as the Priests, who now form the *omega* in the ascent, as they had been the *alpha* in the descent into the Jordan—I say, soon as the Priests ascend the Canaan bank of the river of death, the refluent waters overspread the channel and obliterate the footsteps of Israel.

Now the hearts of the kings of Canaan and of the kings of the Amorites melted within them, when they saw the waves of Jordan obey the signal of the Captain of Israel. But before they proceed to the work of dispossessing the bloodstained inhabitants of the country, their first act is the circumcision of the nation. Then, arriving on Canaan's shore, as they did, on the tenth day of the first month, they select the paschal lamb, and prepare for the first Passover in the land of promise. At Gilgal they make their first encampment. On the morrow after the Passover they first ate the old corn of the land, and soon as they tasted it the windows of heaven were closed, and manna never fell again.

The Prince of the Lord's host, with a naked sword in his hand, now appears to encourage Joshua. Here the apocalyptic *sevens* begin to open to our view. Jericho is besieged. *Seven* Priests, walking before the ark, bearing *seven* trumpets of ram's horns, march for *seven* successive days around the city, blowing the trumpets as they moved along in solemn silence. On the *seventh* day they encompassed the city *seven* times; and as they blew the *seventh* blast, and while all Israel shouted at the command of Joshua, the walls of the fortified city fell flat upon the earth, and exposed its defenceless inhabitants to the devouring sword of incensed justice. Faith, operating by good works, saved Rahab and her house. She alone of all the inhabitants of Jericho escaped the edge of the sword of divine indignation.

The garrison of Ai, with its twelve thousand inhabitants, was next destroyed. Its king was hung upon a tree, and all its warriors were slain in the open field, and the city burned and converted into a heap of ruins. The Gibeonites sue for mercy, and by a stratagem escape the general destruction. But the terror of Joshua having fallen upon all the people of the land, five kings of the Amorites confederate in self-defence, and appear in the field against the garrison of Gibeon. Joshua with his mighty men appears against the besiegers. The universe

Digitized by Google

takes sides with Joshua. The sun, at his bidding, stood still for a whole day upon Gibeon, and the moon sojourned in the valley of Ajalon; and when the confederates fled before Israel, hail from heaven of immense weight fell upon them, and permitted not one of them to escape. Next fell Makkedah, and in quick succession the strong holds of Libnah, Lachish, and Eglon. The king of Gezer and all his army, Hebron and all its cities, Debir and all its cities, were wholly consumed by the sword of Joshua.

A general confederation of all the neighboring kings is the next measure; and their assembled hosts, numerous as the sands of the Red Sea, next take the field. But these could not stand against the sword of Heaven: the Anakims themselves fall before it, and Joshua pushes his victories until no less than *thirty-one kings* and their armies are wholly routed and blotted from the earth.

These immense conquests broke the spirit of the remaining inhabitants of the land; so that Joshua, now old and well stricken in years, was commanded to proceed to the division of the land, leaving the five lords of the Philistines and other Pagans still in possession of certain parts of the promised possession. In company with Eleazer the High Priest and the elders of Israel, Joshua proceeded to partition into nine and one half shares the stipulated precincts. Thus the tribe of Joseph counting two, made in all thirteen tribes; yet still there were but twelve lots; for Levi had no inheritance other than the offerings and forty-eight cities amongst the tribes. Moses having given Reuben and Gad with half of Manasseh their inheritance east of the Jordan, it remained only for Joshua to partition the whole country beyond the Jordan into nine and one half shares.

In reference to some interpreters of prophecy, it is expedient to state with all formality, that Israel was truly and fully invested with all that was promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. There have, indeed, been some speculatists who suppose that the "promise" was not at all fulfilled to Abraham or to his seed, and that its full completion is yet future after the coming of the Messiah. Such had better read the conclusion of the 21st chapter of the book of Joshua. The three last verses unequivocally contradict any such hypothesis. They say, "The Lord gave unto Israel *all the land* which he sware to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it and dwelt in it. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers; and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them: the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel: all came to pass." These words forever negative, in my judgment, that

Digitized by Google

system of interpretation which holds out Canaan as the future inheritance of Israel after the first resurrection, in virtue of what they call the unfulfilled part of the promises to Abraham.

There is no prophecy in the books of Joshua or of the Judges. We have now a series of historic records reaching from the death of Moses to the death of Nehemiah, a period of ten hundred and fifty years.—These books, including Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the book of Samuel, the Kings, and the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, in all twelve, are of the historic character, and prepare the way for the Prophets. There are in these histories, however, a few prophecies to which we shall hereafter very briefly allude.

After Joshua, during the book of twelve Judges, a period of more than three hundred years, we have the various fortunes of Israel very briefly written. Their history is full of instruction and admonition, and ought to be profoundly studied by every man of God. In Joshua we see much of the material of prophecy. The accomplishment of the judgments on the Amorites and the idolatrous nations of that country, and the manner in which Joshua trod down his enemies, explain to us much that is written of the conquests of the Messiah. Not so much, however, the conquests of the sword of the Spirit as the sword of avenging Justice. In the great outline of the wars of Joshua son of Nun, in the slaughter of thirty-one kings and their people, we see the Christian Joshua, as described by Isaiah, "coming from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah, glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength, mighty to save." If we ask him, "Wherefore red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winevat?" He answers, "I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger and trample them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of my vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. I will tread down the people in my anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." The book of Joshua is a just and intelligible comment on these words. For as Joshua gave rest to Israel, so will Jesus give rest to his people by destroying their enemies.

Again, may we not see in the judgment of Jericho, and in the seventh blast accompanied with many voices, the imagery of John, and find a key to the exposition of the seventh trumpet? For when "the seventh angel sounded there were *great voices* in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the possession of our Lord and his Christ;" and what else could Israel see in the ruins of Jericho at the seventh

Digitized by Google

blast of the seventh day, but an assurance that "all the kingdoms of Canaan were now beginning to become the possession of the Lord and his people!" After this, indeed, many battles were to be fought before the whole land of Israel was subdued; so after the walls of Babylon shall fall prostrate at the blast of the seventh angel, and its inhabitants shall become the prey of the avenging sword of insulted Heaven, various other battles are to be fought before all the Pagan nations shall bow willing captives to our Joshua, the Captain of the sacramental host of God's elect nation of nations.

As, then, we find the law in Moses, and Jesus in Joshua, so find we the fortunes of the enemies of the Son of David correctly sketched in the fortunes of the enemies of the Son of Nun; and hence we infer the importance of making the history of the typical people and the fulfilment of ancient prophecies the grammar and dictionary of New Testament predictions.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

PRESBYTERIAN DISCIPLINE.

BALTIMORE, July 25, 1837.

I SEND by the mail to-day the enclosed correspondence between Mr. *George Carson*, Clerk of the Session of the 2d Presbyterian Church in this city, under the pastoral care of Mr. *Robert Breckenridge*, with one of our sisters, *Mary Blakey*, who was formerly one of that sect. The Session thought proper to call our sister to an account after she had been absent twelve months. She has been immersed on profession of the faith, and connected herself with the church assembling in the meeting-house in North street, two squares north of the Post-Office.

Yours in love,

WM. CARMAN.

BALTIMORE, 4th July, 1837.

Dear Sister—I am directed by the Session of the Second Presbyterian Church in this city, to request you to meet them at 4 o'clock P. M. of next Monday, the 10th inst., in their lecture-room attached to that church.

The Session are grieved that you have for some time past absented yourself from public worship and all the ordinances of God in the congregation; and to understand in addition, that you have habitually frequented the meetings of a sect with whose doctrines we cannot hold fellowship—this, too, while your name remains on our roll as a member in full communion, placed there on your own application, and no notice ever given to us of your having any wish to withdraw from us.

Under these circumstances, faithfulness to you, as well as to ourselves and to our Master's cause, requires us to seek the proposed interview, the result of which may, we trust, be to our mutual edification and satisfaction.

GEO. CARSON,

Clerk of Session, 2d Presbyterian Church, Baltimore.

Digitized by Google

To Mr. George Carson, Clerk of Session, 2d Presbyterian Church, Baltimore.

DEAR SIR—I have received your communication directed by the Session of the Church, requesting my attendance on the 10th inst. I reply, that it will not be convenient to comply with the request; but I avail myself of this opportunity of thanking the Body for their solicitude on my account, notwithstanding they are acting under a delusion when they grieve for my absenting myself from public worship and all the ordinances of God in the church—because I have regularly attended to them all, as I conceive, in their original purity, although absent from their congregation. I acknowledge I do meet a few disciples of Christ, whom you call a sect, with whose doctrine you say you cannot hold fellowship. I feel very sorry for you. Christ is our only head; we are governed wholly by his word, of which we have such an exalted opinion as to think it far above the power of human aid; whilst you degrade it by traditions and additions of men, which is the reason why you cannot hold fellowship with us. I confess I joined your congregation through ignorance. I had a zeal, but not according to knowledge; but by searching the Scriptures my eyes were opened—I saw my error, and conscientiously withdrew myself from you. As an act of courtesy, I might, indeed, have requested my name to have been erased from your roll; but I did not think it of importance, and as I am bold enough to think for myself in all matters pertaining to my own eternal salvation, I call no man *leader*, having but one leader—the Messiah; and as a Christian, I speak with the freedom of one enjoying the perfect law of liberty.

MARY BLAKEY.

Baltimore, 8th July, 1837.

BALTIMORE, 12th July, 1837.

Mrs. MARY BLAKEY:

Dear Sister—The Session of the 2d Presbyterian Church has received your letter, and I am requested to reply to it, to refer you to the fourth chapter of the second book of the Form of Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in which you will find the duty of this Session and your privileges clearly laid down. If you have no copy of our standard at hand, I will be happy to furnish you with one.

You will therefore be so good as to consider this note a citation to appear before the Session on Monday, the 24th inst., at 4 o'clock P. M., in the Session room adjoining the church, to reply as you may think best to the following charges, which were intimated in the former letter written to you, and which, as your reply substantially admits them, the Session will not otherwise attempt to prove.

It is within the knowledge of the Session, 1st. That you have for about one year withdrawn yourself from the public ordinances of the gospel as administered in the 2d Presbyterian Church; and that you did this without notice, or application for dismission, while you were a member in full communion in that church, to which you have been admitted on your own application, and on profession of faith in Christ and a desire to follow after him. 2d. You are charged by Common Fame with having united yourself with a sect of professing Christians, commonly called "Campbellite Baptists," who are understood to profess doctrines with which the Presbyterian church has no fellowship.

I trust the Lord will let you see it your duty to meet the Session and bless the result to his glory and our mutual good.

GEO. CARSON, *Clerk of Session.*

Digitized by Google

BALTIMORE, 13th July, 1837.

Mr. GEO. CARSON, Clerk of Session:

Dear Sir—I thank you for the trouble you have taken, and for the anxiety with which you have expressed yourself for our mutual good. My first letter to you did not require an answer, nor does the present one. I admitted the charges because I thought them facts to which no disgrace could be, or can be attached; and as such I answered them, which ought to have been sufficient.

On this occasion I will remark, that you are not authorized to call me names—a Carsonite would have been as applicable to me as a "Campbellite"—I call *no man* Master. Moreover, I am really surprized at your referring me to your book after my stating to you that we were governed by the Inspired Volume, and by it alone. It would have been more appropriate had you referred me to a "thus saith the Lord."

MARY BLAKEY.

This correspondence on the part of our sister will show a good example, worthy of imitation; for the way to love our fellow-creatures is to wish them all the good we think conducive to their happiness, and to procure it for them if in our power. As nothing is more conducive to happiness than virtue, the first and most important duty of society is to display it in its full lustre to those who surround us, in order to make them enamored of it. Now example is the most proper means to produce this effect, and frequently it is the only means in our power. Every man cannot compose books, preach sermons, or make laws. Besides, these are only lifeless pictures which seldom touch the heart, and exhibit only imperfect and often mutilated representations of virtue. The pen and even the tongue itself, like the pencil, paint only the surface: they represent no more than can be perceived at a single glance at the outside. They cannot animate the figure. Example is a living picture, which represents virtue in action, and communicates the impression that moves it to the heart of every spectator. Now every one is capable of giving an example of virtue, since nothing more is requisite than to act uniformly the honest man. The Clerk of Session seems disposed to call hard names; but we have no desire to be the historians of our own wrongs. Let those who believe every thing and examine nothing call us what they please. There are times when even an Apostle, having done all that he can honorably do, would say, "If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." Pride was not made for man; but humility, meekness, and resignation were made for him, and properly belong to his dependent and precarious situation.

The brethren here are living in love and peace, and in the enjoyment of much comfort. Our number is reducing by several going to the West, and others preparing for the same; but we have the promise, "Where two or three are met together in my name, there," says Jesus, "I am in the midst of them." Hence we shall not be forsaken. "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee, for thou Lord hast not forsaken them that seek thee." Thus says David king of Israel.

WM. CARMAN.

In addition to the judicious remarks of our brother Carman, I would say, that this correspondence on the part of the Session of Mr. Robert Breckenridge's church, ought to teach us the necessity and the duty of seeking for the stray sheep. The Session, or Bishop, or some person in every church ought to go in quest of the stray. So far there is nothing faulty on the part of the 2d Presbyterian Church. But I think they wait-

Digitized by Google

ed fifty full weeks too long. The sheep might have been devoured by the wolves in less than half the time.

As to the Presbyterian Church having no fellowship with our doctrine; if they only knew what it is, we should not complain. We indeed have the same liberty and right to declare non-fellowship with their system of doctrine; but we are not such *wholesale* merchants in doctrine as Mr. Breckenridge: we do not, on common rumor, non fellowship whole Synods! We always *hear* before we condemn. We know too much of his system to declare non-fellowship with it: for there are a thousand points of doctrine in which we cordially agree with Mr. Robert Breckenridge, and differ from him only when he differs from the Apostles.

A. C.

LETTERS TO ENGLAND—*No. IV.*

Bethany, Va. August 15th, 1837.

Mr. J. Wallis:

Dear Sir—I learn from London, per the mail of August 6th, by our brother Elder *John Thomas* of that city, that pains are being taken to put the English and Scotch Christians on their guard against our views of reformation on the subject of spiritual influence. This, I doubt not, from the very interesting letter just received from brother Thomas, is done from conscientious scrupulosity. It becomes therefore necessary, that, while on the subject of personal reformation as respects the conversion of sinners, I should be fairly understood on this most interesting point. The three last numbers of this work, containing Elder Lynd's letter to me and my remarks upon it, will go very far to correct the mistaken views being now put in circulation on this topic. Had I lived in England or Scotland, it is a thousand to one if I had written one sentence on the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners, for one hundred that I have written here. The reason is, that conversion is in thousands of instances effected in the New World by a machinery unknown, in a very great measure, to the English and Scotch population. In America, my good brother, many things vegetate and luxuriate which would not germinate in your cold and moist climate. Neither melons nor camp-meetings grow in the open air in your fields; nor do mourning benches nor anxious boards grow in the forests and woods of England—at least in my time I heard nothing of them. Whereas, in this new world, more especially since the days of high and low pressure operating on steam boats and rail road cars, every thing "goes a-head." There is no doubt, sir, by the association of ideas, or by some yet mysterious affinity, a peculiar sympathy exists between all the pursuits of men; and when changes, sometimes miscalled improvements in

Digitized by Google

society, become the order of the day, they ramify and extend through all the operations of the mind; and hence improvements in agriculture, in manufactures, in commerce; new discoveries in science or in the arts of life mingle with our religious theories and conceptions. The reason why you think more and change less than we do—why you have more profound scholars and more accomplished writers, will be found in part in the fact that you live in an old country, and we in a new world, where "*go a-head*" is equally graceful in the senate chamber, the college, the church, and the steam car. Only think that English grammar is, in this climate, perfectly taught, both the theory and the practice, in two weeks—astronomy in five lectures, and geography in four—and men are truly converted by the Spirit without the knowledge of any one of the four gospels.

Publish it, my dear sir, in the length and breadth of your land, that it is this theory of spiritual operations—this species of divine influence in "camp-meetings" and "big meetings"—this idealess, headless, and heartless religion, which, on the principle of animal magnetism, or some non-descript human sympathy, has filled meeting-houses with converts that have no root in themselves; that is, no clear perception, no correct sentiments or views of the system of grace, called the gospel of the kingdom—which we oppose, and not at all the influence of the HOLY SPIRIT, as the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, and the SPIRIT OF GRACE on saint or sinner.

True, indeed, there is even among the more intelligent classes in this country, and perhaps in yours, a peculiar theory of spiritual operations, which I have sometimes called "metaphysical regeneration," or "scholastic conversion," as sheer fatalism as is found in the moth-eaten records of the ancient worshippers of FATE. This speculative theology makes the existence of faith in the human understanding or heart a miracle of the same order with the resurrection of Christ. This system works faith in the human heart without testimony, and without the knowledge of Christ. A man believes because he is one of the elect in virtue of a sovereign interposition, which, when resolved into the last *why*, amounts to the single reason, I believe because I could not help it. Even this may be true in a certain sense, yet not as held forth in the dogma which we have in our eye. It ascends so high in the ethereal regions as to make the new moral creature as physical an offspring as the infusion of a spirit into Adam from the immediate lips of Jehovah. This ultraism on the one hand, is our *Scylla;* while the notion that there is no Spirit of God but the Word, and no operation of the Spirit, direct or indirect, upon the heart of sinner or saint, is our *Charybdis*. We push our feeble bark between these two.

Digitized by Google

In preaching to a promiscuous throng that something called *the gospel*, we always preach *good news* to sinners. Now to preach that A believes because he is first regenerated, and that he is regenerated because he was from all eternity elected to be regenerated at such a time, and at such a place, and by such a preacher, and by such a sermon, and by such a text; and that he was so elected to be regenerated because of nothing in himself; not because of his views, feelings, wishes, or efforts; but because God would, for reasons of his own, drawn neither from the sinner nor his circumstancees, but from himself alone, have him to be converted; I say, thus to represent the matter is good news to not a single soul in the congregation; because, should there be one or more of these elect ones among the audience, they, not knowing it for certain, cannot rejoice in the message which I deliver; and of course, if any one supposes himself not to be of that number, it is to him everlasting anguish and despair.

Again, to represent the salvation of the sinner to be of himself alone, or to depend wholly and entirely upon his own efforts; and that God will never do for him more than he has already done, is to give a wrong representation of the sinner to himself—of his power to please God, and also of the benevolence and grace of our heavenly Father, who has actually promised his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. And if that Spirit be not needful to our salvation in addition to all that God the Father has purposed, and all that Jesus the Christ has performed, and all that the Apostles have written, why, in the name of reason, should it be so often promised, and we taught and commanded to pray for it?

The glory of the Christian religion is, that God dwells in the hearts of his people by his Holy Spirit; and that, indeed, he is their strength in weakness, their health in sickness, their joy in sorrow, and their life in death. "I will dwell in them, and walk in them"—"I will write my laws upon their heart"—"I will be their God, and they shall be my people"—"I will never leave them nor forsake them," are, I thank the Lord, exceeding great and precious promises of the Christian institution, by which we are made partakers of a divine nature, and, without which, we should be often in despair of eternal life.

But in seeking to bring men back to God, as I have often said, we do not theorize or dogmatize. We preach Christ, and not the Spirit—we preach Christ crucified, and no theory about the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit; in whose sacred names, in whose holy and mysterious relations, and in whose distinct and peculiar operations, as the operations of one and the same God, we do most cordially and sincerely believe and rejoice. That in the heat and ardor of controversy, some unwarranted expressions may have been uttered either by ourselves or

Digitized by Google

others, we presume neither to affirm nor to deny. When Paul writes of the justification of *sinners* by faith, one would think he had no use for works; and when James writes of the justification of *Christians* by works, one would imagine that faith was a matter of small moment; so when we speak of the perfection of the word of God, and of its intelligibility, clearness, power, and ability to convert sinners, or to make the man of God perfect, one would think we had no use for the Spirit of God; and to hear us on other occasions speak to Christians of the necessity of cherishing and not grieving that Holy Spirit, and of the need of his assistance and consolations under trials, and to hear us invoke his aid in directing our hearts in the love of God, and in sanctifying our whole persons to the Lord, one might infer we made but little account of the word.

The Scriptures sometimes ascribe all to the Word, which at other times they ascribe to the Spirit; and sometimes they ascribe to the Spirit all, which at other times they ascribe to the Word: so do we; and what God has thus joined together we will not, because we dare not, separate. I beseech you, dear brother, to be at pains to have our views on this subject fairly stated to our brethren and friends in Great Britain.

May the love of God our Father, the grace of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and the comforts of the Holy Spirit be with you all! Amen!

A. CAMPBELL.

News from the Churches.

From the Christian Publisher.

Revolutions, moral or political, seldom move backwards. It is difficult to arrest the progress of the ball when once put in motion: propelled as it is by the lovers of truth, who are willing to sacrifice every thing for the glory of God and the welfare of men. It is true that it sometimes meets with obstructions, which give it a wrong direction; and hence the necessity of prudence and discretion that it may be safely and properly directed. Truth for a time may be retarded, and apparently defeated; but, being imperishable and invincible, it will *finally prevail*.

The disciples in Eastern Virginia, for some time past, have had much to contend with; and although but little has been done towards the furtherance of the gospel, yet the prospect has evidently brightened of late, and we look forward to rich harvests at no distant day.

Every unfavorable circumstance that happens amongst us is greatly magnified by our opponents; and some have been led to think that the

Digitized by Google

cause was rapidly declining, and that the gospel of Christ, nick-named "*Campbellism*," would soon be numbered among the exploded theories of by-gone days.

The church in Richmond has been reported as dead, and as ominous of the fate of the cause elsewhere. But we are glad to inform the brethren that our clerical friends will not be troubled shortly to preach the funeral of the cause in that place. We have lately visited this church, and were encouraged by what we saw. There are a goodly number of devoted disciples there, who are far from despairing. On last Lord's day, brother Henshall and myself preached with them and immersed six. The prospect for building up the church is good, if they had the labors of an active and prudent Evangelist.

Brother John D. Ferguson, of Shenandoah, in an excursion through several of the upper and lower counties, preached with success. In Page, Nelson, and Augusta counties, and also in Fredericksburg, he had the pleasure of introducing some into the kingdom.

We believe the cause is prospering in Montgomery. There are four churches in that county, built upon *the true foundation*. Brother Bullard is the only proclaimer. May he be abundantly blessed in his noble efforts to reinstate the Christianity of the New Testament in that region of opposition!

In the county of Shenandoah the cause is successfully advocated by our beloved brother Ferguson and his son J. D. Ferguson. There are four churches in the county, numbering perhaps from three to four hundred disciples.

The church in Charlottesville is in a healthy condition—the disciples live in harmony, and are continuing steadfastly in the "Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in breaking the loaf, and in prayers." It has steadily increased in numbers since its first organization. Five were immersed by brother Goss during the past week.

In the counties of King & Queen and King William, from twelve to fifteen have been lately baptized.

In several of the Baptist churches in Orange and Spottsylvania, the leaven of truth has been at work; and some of the Lord's people in obedience to the command, "Come out of her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not her plagues," have nobly joined the disciples in the defence of the truth, and the practice of the "all things" commanded to be observed by them.

In the bounds of the Albemarle (Baptist) Association the seeds of the good cause have been disseminated; and we are firmly persuaded that in the minds of many members of that body, they have not been sown in vain. *Very shortly* they will yield the fruits of obedience to the honor and glory of God and his Son Jesus Christ. But let those who have heard the truth, guard against the many insidious efforts that will be made to pluck it from their minds. Let not the influence of fear, interest, or prejudice induce you to hide the LIGHT of the glorious gospel of the Son of God! I know the magic spell that binds the minds and consciences of many among our quondam brethren. The terror of the Association!—the terror of a separation from those with whom we have been long united!—the terror of the opposition of friends and relations!—the terror that strikes the soul with horror when, with all clerical gravity and policy, the humble followers of Jesus are denounced from

Digitized by Google

the pulpits of this age as "damnable heretics!" "Campbellites!!" "blasphemers against the Holy Ghost!!!"

But in view of all this human threatening, this ecclesiastical terror, remember the words of him who bore *denunciations* more *terrible* than these: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that *have no more that they can do* But I forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear Him who, after he *hath killed, hath the power to cast into* HELL; yea, I say unto you, FEAR HIM!"

Own HIM *here*, and he will own you *hereafter;* disown him here, and your future destiny must be wrapt in ignominy and eternal disgrace! And remember well that to own him, you must do more than lisp his name and "profess religion." To own him is to acknowledge his authority in all his *institutions* and *appointments*. To be a subject of his kingdom, you must be *obedient to all the laws of the kingdom, as found in that glorious constitution* (the New Testament) *which he has given you*. Are you members of congregations organized according to *that* CONSTITUTION with its BISHOPS and DEACONS? Do you meet every Lord's day according to his instructions, and attend steadfastly to the "Apostles' doctrine, to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread, and to prayers?" Are you by "patient continuance in well doing seeking for glory, honor, and immortality?" Are you a "city set upon a hill?" Are you "holding forth the word of life?" The Bridegroom will soon be here—make you ready to go out and meet him, is the exhortation of one who loves you.——*Ed. C. P.*

P. S. In a communication from Elder Henley, he says, "At Smyrna several have lately been immersed, and at Mangohick twelve." Brother Webber writes, "The day after you left, I immersed my father-in-law; and on last Lord's day I immersed three others."

CARTHAGE, Ohio, July 31, 1837.

On the last Lord's day in June brethren Burnet, Watkins, and myself held a protracted meeting at Harrison, distant from this place about 23 miles. While we continued on the ground twenty-one were added, and the next evening after we left seven more were added: since that time several others have made the good confession, and prospects there are as good, if not better, than here.

On the second Lord's day in July brother Burnet and your humble servant held a protracted meeting in Dayton. We prevailed upon only five to make the good confession. Prospects at the last named place are not so good as in these regions, perhaps for the want of attention.

On last Tuesday evening I addressed a *good* audience at White Oak, and was pleased to see four come forward; and on the next morning I immersed them, after they confessed that they believed that Jesus was the Christ. Prospects at the last named place are by no means bad.

There have been three immersed at Cumminsville recently.

The greater part of these disciples are young persons; I remember but one or two that is above 30 years of age, the greater part between 15 and 25. How pleasant it was to see the dear youths submitting to the commandments of God! It was, indeed, refreshing to the drooping spirits of all the disciples. And may the good Lord bless them and protect them is my continual prayer.

There is one injunction that I hope these young disciples will bear in

Digitized by Google

mind:—"Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise." Obedience is not the only thing enjoined here, but *respect* for parents is also inferred. And the youth that disobeys or treats with disrespect his or her parents in the Lord, does virtually offend in a most important point; for if we treat with disrespect our parents whom we have seen, how can it be taken for granted that we respect our heavenly Father whom we have not seen? We conclude that it may be taken for granted that young disciples that do not obey and respect, or *honor* their parents in the Lord, do not obey and honor the heavenly Father. We therefore advise those who are trying to obey and honor their heavenly Father, to be careful to obey their parents in the Lord—to honor their fathers, inasmuch as in thus doing they will do right.

By the congregation in this place I am requested to ask brother Campbell whether it would be convenient for him to attend a big meeting at Carthage, to be held at any time after the 15th of September, or before the 15th of October. But although I am at Carthage, and would be pleased for you to be present at a big meeting here, I would rather you would remember Dayton. If you come to Cincinnati this fall, brother, you must, IF POSSIBLE, see Dayton. [If possible, I will see Dayton.—A. C.] LOVE H. JAMESON.

CICERO, New York, July 28, 1837.

The good cause is making some progress in this country. *Thirty-five* have recently been immersed at Throopsville, Cayuga county. *Three* have also lately put on Christ in this place. The brethren contemplate a series of big meetings in this country this fall. We hope to see many converted.

Brothers Moss and Sanders from Ohio, and our brethren Shepard and Bartlett, have been travelling and laboring in this state for a few weeks past with very interesting results. H. JOSLIN.

MADISON, Indiana, August 4, 1837.

For the information of the friends of the Redeemer, but especially for those of our brethren who may come to this place to make it their permanent residence, or who may visit it only for a short time, I wish to make known to them through the medium of the Harbinger, that there is a congregation of disciples here who meet together every Lord's day to keep the institutions of the Lord's house as they are laid down in the New Testament.

In June, 1836, eighteen brethren and sisters united together as a church of God in Christ Jesus, in this town. Since then we have enjoyed the labors of several proclaimers of the gospel; but principally through the instrumentality of our beloved brethren Jesse Mavity and William M. Brown, our number has increased to about sixty. Brother Jesse Mavity resides in the vicinity of this place, and is doing much for the good cause both here and elsewhere.

Since the formation of the church fifteen of our fellow-citizens have been buried with the Lord in baptism, and united to us; some of whom have been immersed by our beloved brother Brown this summer.

The cause of Christ (notwithstanding the opposition arrayed against it) is evidently gaining in this region. Oh! that all men every where would submit to the mild sceptre of Prince Immanuel, and that the

Digitized by Google

friends of the Redeemer in every place would remember and practise their duty to God and their fellow-men!

JOHN M. BRAMWELL.

Postscript.—Since writing the above, one other person has been immersed and added to the congregation.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, Kentucky, July 24, 1837.

You desire to hear from the churches and to learn the progress of the present reformation, and I should be glad that I had the ability to give you a true picture of the state of things in the bounds of my acquaintance: I will, however, attempt a sketch of the state of affairs in my own neighborhood. There are but few, very few of the congregations, that, in their personal, relative, and congregational order, have come up to the standard of the New Testament; but most generally they seem to be satisfied to be able to compare with the neighboring sects, or even indeed with some of their moral acquaintances. True, indeed, many of the more intelligent of our churches appear to be sensible what ought to be done; but there is to me somewhere a manifest want of moral power in the churches to draw together all their members into one place every first day of the week—to bind them together, and fill them with peace, righteousness, and joy in the Holy Spirit—to produce that humility, sobriety, gravity, and self-denial which are so essential to the character of a Christian.

There is to me an important question that ought to be settled, viz.—Why is the power of the gospel, as proclaimed by our brethren, in its effects so clearly proved to be ancient and divine; while that of the order of the churches is so manifestly deficient in power to purify, sanctify, and perfect in holiness the many converts added to her, as appears in the true history of the present reformation? I shall, however, be truly gratified to be convinced that I am mistaken in this matter.

We have had the pleasure of a visit from brother *Walter Scott* a few weeks past. He had large congregations to hear him, and no doubt has left lasting impressions on the minds of many. He is truly an interesting proclaimer. May the Lord long sustain him in the good cause. There were eight baptized while he was with us, four of whom were of my family. Several others have been baptized in the course of a few weeks and added to the churches of Flat Rock, Herod's Creek, and Goose Creek—probably amounting in all to above 20. O that they may keep their begun hope firm unto the end!

B. ALLEN.

CALEDONIA, Washington county, Mo., July 13, 1837.

I have united with the Baptist brethren here, in consequence of my being alone as relates to the views maintained by the disciples; and trust that good may result from our union. They were apprised of my religious views previously to my joining them, and received me nevertheless with much cordiality. Have I done right or wrong in this matter? Please say. [*Certainly, in my judgment.*—A. C.] The brethren for the most part only meet once-a-month for worship; but I think they are willing to do better if we could once get in the way. O that we had a brother settled amongst us, fitly qualified to teach us the way of the Lord more perfectly! We are also much in want of a female teacher in our immediate vicinity, and I would engage to give a fair price for one.

J. W. JEFFRESS.

Digitized by Google

HANOVER, *Tazwell county, Illinois*, July 23, 1837.

The cause of our Master is gradually progressing. There have been some 10 or 15 immersions in two or three weeks past. The churches are generally doing well: there have been four new ones established this spring and summer. W. DAVENPORT.

THE PRINCESS VICTORIA AND THE SUPREMACY OF LAW.

THE most magnificent monument on earth of the transcendent power of intellectual and moral excellence, of a happy combination of Protestant science, literature, and religion, is found in the fact, that at this moment a young lady of 18 years, living in the island of Great Britain, now gives laws to nearly a fourth part of the whole human race. Protestant England, with all her faults and errors, has more science, literature, religion, and morality, more genius and talent, more *educated mind*, than any nation on the face of the wide earth. She has in her community as much freedom of thought, of speech, of the press—as much free discussion, as much liberty of conscience, as can be found in our own country, and much more than can be found in any other country visited by the light of our American Sun, Moon, and Stars. She has a constitution and laws after which even we have modelled; and her government is that of enlightened public opinion, expressed through her public functionaries—differing, it is true, from ours, in the names of office, and in the nature of the tenure by which offices are held. Still her government is that of public opinion, expressed in a Magna Charta, and in well-digested laws and statutes, subject to amendment as often as in the judgment of the whole nation they can be improved for the better.

Great Britain, though comparatively a small island, separated from the great continents, possessing neither the finest climate, nor the richest soil, has nevertheless extended her language, her science, her arts, and her religion over large portions both of the Old World and of the New.

Her empire is now the largest and the most powerful in the world. At home she has a population of 25,000,000; in Hanover, 1,000,000; in British India she governs 159,352,000; in Canada, North America, and the West India Islands, 3,000,100; in the Ionian Islands, 209,000; in the Cape of Good Hope and other colonies, 1,000,000; in the Island of Ceylon, 1,000,000—making in the aggregate, a population of *one hundred and seventy-two millions, four hundred and fifty-two thousand!*

At the head of this immense empire, containing almost three times as many persons as that of Russia, the next most colossal empire on earth,

Digitized by Google

is now placed the Princess ALEXANDRINA VICTORIA, daughter of the late Duke of Kent, a young lady of good common sense, and a good domestic education, who a few weeks since completed her 18th year—a splendid proof of the supremacy of law over all the prejudices, passions, and customs of the age in which we live.

All this must be regarded by the philosopher as the result of that enlargement of soul, of energy, and enterprize which grew out of the doctrine of *free discussion*, which was most singularly and providentially made the popular doctrine of England in the reign of Henry VIII Her present constitution, her liberal views, her increasing tolerance, her free institutions, her improvements in all the sciences and in all the arts of peace and war, have arisen from this most magnificent of all modern events—THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION. A. C.

A GOOD IDEA.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, July 29th, 1837.

Dear brother Campbell—ALLOW me to invite your attention to another temple of which you said nothing in your essay on Temples—I mean that one which was built after the Babylonian Captivity, the building of which was superintended by Ezra and Nehemiah. *In this temple no cloud nor vapor appeared.*

If we are the aptitype of any thing, I conclude we must look back to this temple for our type, and not to the one built by Solomon. That has had its antitype already, which was built by Jesus and his Apostles. But we are now trying to build one in imitation of the old one, and we must not suppose we can equal the first one, nor that the presence of the Lord will be manifested in it, as it was in the former. We need not expect any thing but a part of the old furniture, and especially the constitution and laws. But I have said enough to serve as a text for you.

Affectionately yours, W. WINANS.

BISHOP PURCELL AND MR. KINMONT.

HIS Lordship, my friend the Bishop, has again saddled and mounted my friend Mr. Kinmont, and I fear he and St. Ligori, a fearful load! will be too much for his single shoulders. The following instance of spontaneous combustion shows how the arrows of the late discussion stick in the wounded side of the Pontiff of Ohio:—

'Since the publication of the debate on the Roman Catholic religion, between A. Campbell and Bishop Purcell, many persons have asked me several times to make the statement in writing, whether the Latin passage quoted from Ligori, in the last page in the book, (and a translation of which is given) is to be regarded as a tacit permission from the Council of Trent, that clergymen may keep concubines, on the condition of paying a stipulated fine? Most unquestionably it is not so to be regarded; and any person may satisfy himself on that point, who will turn to pages 319-20, where, being called on, I gave an abstract of the decree of the Council here referred to by Ligori. If he finds any thing in the decree in the shape of encouragement, or connivance in regard to the offence, his mind must be strangely warped by prejudice.

It might be surmised by the insulated extract, that the church drew a revenue from the vices of her priesthood, and therefore winked at them; but, read the extract and the decree together, and you will be convinced that the inference is entirely gratuitous. There is certainly nothing in the passage here quoted, or in any one in Ligori, (which I could find) to countenance the allegation that *priests may keep concubines by paying a fine*, unless it be considered that to punish an offence is to permit or encourage it. A. KINMONT

"*Cincinnati*, May 22, 1837."

Digitized by Google

This is smoke to the eyes of the half awakened Romanists. The proposition was never uttered by me, nor by any one as far as I know, that *the church of Rome did keep an open office for granting licenses to Roman clergymen to keep concubines, for so much a year;* and that she devoted this *sin-money* to building of churches, nunneries, &c. But the proposition was, and is, that the church of Rome regards, by her statutes and laws, *concubinage in a Priest as a less sin than marriage.* She does *fine* for the former, but she does not fine for the latter!! SHE EXCOMMUNICATES FOR THE WIFE, BUT TAKES MONEY FOR THE CONCUBINE. Deny this, gentlemen, if you dare!

How many churches have been built by this sin money I know not: but I am historically certain that if all the Priests had been fined according to Trent and St. Ligori, which ought to have been fined by these statutes; and if the money had been faithfully expended, there would be more chapels and meeting-houses now standing on earth than would hold all the good Catholics in the four quarters of the world. A. C.

SLANDER AND VULGARITY.—"UNITED BRETHREN."

CANAL DOVER, July 6, 1837.

Brother Campbell—By this day's mail I send you a pamphlet which the "United Brethren" and some of the Methodists are circulating through this country. The author is the editor of the "Telescope," a religious paper, published under the auspices of the "United Brethren Church" of Ohio. The office is in Circleville, Ohio. If that church is governed by the same regulations here that it is in Maryland, then the *church*, and not their ignorant and railing editor, is responsible for the matter of said pamphlet. In Maryland no preacher or member of that church is permitted to publish any book or pamphlet, without such book receiving the sanction of a standing committee appointed for that purpose. If so, then the "Church of the United Brethren in Christ" have sanctioned the publication, of not only the frothy and untaught matters of said pamphlet, but also of the low, vulgar, and dirty little poem attached to it, which the author calls the "anonymous oration of A. Campbell."

My regard for you personally, and more particularly for the cause in which you are engaged, are my only reasons for troubling you with this pamphlet and these lines. Believing you will know what is best for you to do on the subject, I remain yours in haste, in hope of the final triumph of *Christianity* over sectarian hypocrisy and malignity.

D. WINDER.

A grave notice of this blasphemous pamphlet would be unworthy of any disciple of Christ. It is one of the very meanest of the mean slanders in print. The author of the doggerel poem, now most falsely called "the anonymous oration of A. Campbell," with all his house, I believe, has gone down to the grave. I think his friends, out of mercy to his memory and out of self-respect, ought to have suppressed their "learned Camel," instead of stereotyping so much shame for themselves. A. C.

THE HERETIC DETECTOR.

"THE HERETIC DETECTOR," &c. &c. by *A. Crikfield*, Ohio, from a *quarterly* has become a *monthly*, of 32 pages, or 384 pages per volume—$1,00 per annum, in advance, for single subscribers, or six copies for $5,00, or twelve for $10,00, or twenty for $15,00, or thirty-two for $20,00. Subscribers must begin and end with a volume. Failures by mail made good. ☞ Subscriptions taken at this office

This work is very cheap, not because of the paper and ink, but because of its spirited defence of the gospel, and many excellent and fundamental views of Christian truth.

A. C.

ERRATA.—Page 381, third line from bottom, for "*and*" read *where we*.
Page 408, sixth line from top, for "*their*" read *his*.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER X.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *October*, 1837.

NEW SCHOOL DIVINITY.

FROM THE CROSS AND BAPTIST JOURNAL.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH—*Doctrines True and False.*

THE following document contains an expose of the doctrinal views of what is called the New School portion of the Presbyterian Church, on those points which have occasioned dissensions in that body. It is a part of the protest of those condemned as holding erroneous doctrines, against the act of the General Assembly, by which they were declared unsound in the faith.

8. We protest, finally, because in view of the circumstances of the case, we feel that, while we were prevented from uniting in the final vote with the majority in their testimony against error, for the reasons above stated, we owe it to ourselves, to our brethren, to the church, and to the world, to declare and protest, that it is not because we do directly or indirectly hold or countenance the errors stated. We are willing to bear our testimony in full against them, and now do so, when, without misapprehension and liability to have our vote misconstrued, we avow our real sentiments, and contrast them with the errors condemned; styling them, as we believe the true doctrine, in opposition to erroneous doctrine condemned, as follows, viz.—

Error 1. That God would have prevented the existence of sin in our world, but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man; or for aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.

True doctrine. God permitted the introduction of sin, not because he was unable to prevent it consistently with the moral freedom of his creatures, but for wise and benevolent reasons which he has not revealed.

Digitized by Google

Error 2. That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.

True doctrine. Election to eternal life is not founded on a foresight of faith and obedience, but in a sovereign act of God's mercy, whereby according to the counsel of his own will he has chosen some to salvation; "yet so as thereby neither is violence offered the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established;" nor does this gracious purpose ever take effect independently of faith and holy life.

Error 3. That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam, than with the sins of any other parent.

True doctrine. By a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race, that as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind become morally corrupt, and liable to death, temporal and eternal.

Error 4. That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement, as was Adam, when he was created.

True doctrine. Adam was created in the image of God, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. Infants came into the world, not only destitute of these, but with a nature inclined to evil, and only evil.

Error 5. That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God as brute animals, and their suffering and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.

True doctrine. Brute animals sustain no such relation to the moral government of God, as does the human family. Infants are a part of the human family. And their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the ground of their being involved in the general moral ruin of the race induced by the apostacy.

Error 6. That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; or that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture that infants, in order salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

True doctrine. Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostacy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression. And all infants, as well as adults, in order to be saved, need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

Error 7. That the doctrine of imputation, whether of Adam's sin, or Christ's righteousness, has no foundation in the Word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.

Digitized by Google

True doctrine. The sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts, and demerits; but, by reason of the sin of Adam in his peculiar relation, the race are treated as if they had sinned. Nor is the righteousness of Christ imputed to his people in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts, and merit; but by reason of his righteousness, in his peculiar relation, they are treated as if they were righteous.

Error 8. That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.

True doctrine. The sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental, and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, i. e. a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors. And while Christ did not suffer the literal penalty of the law, involving remorse of conscience and the pains of hell, he did offer a sacrifice which infinite wisdom saw to be a full equivalent. And by virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely made to the race, and salvation secured to all who believe.

Error 9. That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.

True doctrine. While sinners have all the faculties necessary to a perfect moral agency and a just accountability; such is their love of sin and opposition to God and his law, that independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, they never will comply with the commands of God.

Error 10. That Christ never intercedes for any but those who are actually united to him by faith; or that Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.

True doctrine. The intercession of Christ for the elect is previous as well as subsequent to their regeneration, as appears from the following scripture, viz. "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through thy word."

Error 11. That saving faith is the mere belief of the Word of God, and not the grace of the Holy Spirit.

True doctrine. Saving faith is an intelligent and cordial assent to the testimony of God concerning his Son, and implying reliance on Christ alone for pardon and eternal life; and in all cases it is an effect of the special operations of the Holy Spirit.

Error 12. That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself; and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which

Digitized by Google

he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly a persuasive exhibition of truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or that regeneration is not an instaneous act, but a progressive work.

True doctrine. Regeneration is a radical change of heart, produced by the special operations of the Holy Spirit, "determining the sinner to that which is good;" and is in all cases instantaneous.

Error 13. That God has done all that he can for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest.

True doctrine. While repentance for sin and faith in Christ are indispensable to salvation, all who are saved are indebted from first to last to the grace and Spirit of God. And the reason that God does not save all, is, not that he wants the power to do it, but that in his wisdom he does not see fit to exert that power farther than he actually does.

Error 14. That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner, without impairing their moral agency.

True doctrine. While the liberty of the will is not impaired, nor the established connexion betwixt means and ends broken, by any action of God on the mind, he can influence it according to his pleasure, and does effectually determine it to good in all cases of true conversion.

Error 15. That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God; that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.

True doctrine. All believers are justified, not on the ground of personal merits, but solely on the ground of the obedience and death, or, in other words, the righteousness of Christ. And while that righteousness does not become theirs in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities and merit; yet from respect to it, God can, and does treat them as if they were righteous.

Error 16. That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the gospel, is, that they make themselves to differ.

True doctrine. While all such as reject the doctrine of Christ do it not by coercion, but freely; and all who embrace it do it not by coercion, but freely, the reason why some differ from others, is, that God has made them to differ.

[Signed] GEORGE DUFFIELD, BAXTER DICKINSON, ABSALOM PETERS, and others.

IT is due to the age in which we live, as well as to our present readers, that we inscribe on our pages the preceding authentic expose of the new doctrines, as they are called, of the New

Digitized by Google

School. But, really, on carefully reading the whole matter, it appears to be a very moderate reform—a very slight digression from the good old way of Presbyterianism—a very lean cause for a new swarm of Presbyterians. These *sixteen* speculations smack much more of St. Augustin, or St. Hierome, or St. Athanasius, than of Saint Peter, or Saint Paul, or of the Sermon on the Mount. A slim foundation, truly, for a new church; and a still more unworthy cause of the awful anathema of the greater excommunication! The firm belief of all of them will never be asked of any man, in order to justification or sanctification on earth, or in order to an admission into the eternal city. There will be multitudes in heaven who never heard one of these dogmas; and, perhaps, some in gehenna who have preached them all.

Oh! that the time were come when the Lord had bestowed a *pure speech* upon Zion!—when the dialect of the Apostles, rather than that of the schools, will be the standard of Christian doctrine! Of the language of Ashdod we find many striking samples in these sixteen tenets. It is not, however, my purpose, as it is not my business, to review them; but, really, I must say, that if this be a *bona fide* manifestation of the doctrinal points at issue, it is a war about nothing: for if I am any judge of language, there is as much of all that is called *fatalism* in the new creed as in the old.

The New School avers its belief that not even an infant can be saved without *the special operations of the Holy Spirit* upon its constitution, anterior to its hearing, knowing, or believing the truth: thus making regeneration to consist in a special physical operation, without argument, motive, or persuasion: for, of these, infants of a few months old are insusceptible; yet, according to the doctrine of the New School, such infants, without a single idea, are proper subjects of such special operations, and cannot be saved without them! These operations, too, cannot be superinduced by the infant—they are as sovereign as absolute will; and they are not the fortune or lot of all, but of some infants; for while only some *experience*, all infants *need* this regeneration. Can any one delineate a purer fatalism than the fatalism of the sixth metaphysical "true doctrine"! Unless, then, there are two sorts of regeneration, or of special operations—one for infants,

Digitized by Google

and another for adults—the destiny of every individual cannot in the least depend upon himself any more than his parents, country, or surrounding circumstances. This is Owenism with a witness.

But again, what is the use of missionary labors? for if infants, without either the knowledge of sin or of Christ, may be regenerated by special operations, why may not the Eastern or the Western Indians be also regenerated and saved by a similar process, without the knowledge of the Bible!!

This doctrine is also clearly taught in the ninth "*true doctrine*," which, independent of the intellectual and moral constitution of man and of the Bible too, demands a separate "*almighty power*" of the Holy Spirit as essential to any compliance with gospel requisitions. Now this almighty energy is prerequisite to any act of obedience, even to asking for this aid acceptably. This again hangs up the destiny of all mankind upon a certain special almighty operation, which is not upon all; and in superinducing which, the adult is just as impotent as a deaf and dumb infant. If this be the theory of the New School, their interpretation of the Confession of Faith is most certainly as orthodox as that of their forefathers. I pray you, then, gentlemen, not to excommucate one another for nothing.

The twelfth dogma asserts that this almighty energy is not only sovereign, but also *instantaneons*. There is no approach to it: there is no being ready for it: it is purely instantaneous. It is not to be sought: for God cannot listen to the unregenerate; nor can there be any approach to that which is wholly independent of moral means, and of which a new-born infant is as susceptible as the most deeply penitent adult. This is the true doctrine of the creed and of the catechism as I have learned them: for this resolves the salvation of each individual into a matter over which he has no control, and in which he has no more to think, will, or do, than in the creation of primeval light. His eternal fortune hangs upon an eternal decree, as irreversible as the will of Omnipotence.

The thirteenth "*true doctrine*" asserts the reason that God does not save all, to be, not that he wants power, but will. It is susceptible of no other interpretation. The reason of the lack of will is found in the assumption that his wisdom saw not fit so to will and so to exert his power that all might be saved.

Digitized by Google

We neither affirm nor deny the truth of these speculations; but we affirm that, from these data, if there be nothing behind the curtains, the New School is as orthodox as the Old School. There is no Unitarianism, nor Pelagianism, nor Arminianism in the one that is not in the other. This is as pure fatalism, or absolutism, and as pure physical metaphysical regeneration, as pure passivity and sovereignty in the one scheme as in the other. For the honor of our common Protestantism, I would humbly beseech these belligerents in the General Assembly to pause and think before they farther advance in the paths of discord, anarchy, and ruin. If there must be a separation, let it be for something substantial—not for an airy nothing, without habitation, and without name, save in the sixteenth story of the grand museum of abstractions. If salvation, holiness, and happiness, depended upon the power to comprehend the difference between New and Old Schoolism, as above sketched, then I would ask, Who, O ye Rabbins! shall be saved? A. C.

OPINIONISM—*No. I.*

THERE is a growing taste for *opinionism* in the ranks of reformation. This must be quashed, or there will be an end to all moral and religious improvement. It has ever been the harbinger of schism, the forerunner of all discord, vain jangling, and bad feeling amongst all classes of religionists. It has, indeed, ever been the plague of Christendom. I have therefore resolved to be clearly and fully understood on this subject; and shall be at pains to define this new name of an ancient pest, with all perspicuity and precision.

And first let me ask, What is an *opinion?* "*Persuasion without proof,*" say some of our lexicographers. It is a speculation built on probable evidence. It is neither knowledge nor faith; but, in the absence of these, it is an inference, a conclusion to which the mind inclines or assents according to its information and modes of reasoning. As vision puts an end to faith, and fruition to hope, so knowledge and belief put an end to opinion. *Knowledge* is our own experience; *faith*, our assurance of the

Digitized by Google

experience of others; and *opinion*, our persuasion of the probability of a matter which we neither know nor believe. In one sentence, then, knowledge is the certainty of our own experience; faith, the certainty of the experience of other persons; opinion, the probability of our own reasonings. I *know* that honey is sweet; I *believe* that William IV. is dead; and I *am of opinion* that the North American Indians are of Abraham's extraction.

An *opinionist* is one fond of opinions, but especially of his own. Opinionism, then, it may be presumed, is fondness for opinions. But that I may meet the exigency of the crisis and give a proper latitude to this term, I hereby define *opinionism* to be, *the liberty of propagating one's own opinions.*

Some of our correspondents suppose *opinionism*, as thus defined, to be an element, an essential part of Christian liberty; and if any restrictions should be imposed upon their benevolent efforts to propagate whatever comes into their heads, they instantly complain of an infringement of their rights. It is not long since we have been blamed by some for not opening our pages to the propagation of certain opinions, and thereby have incurred the censure of not paying a proper regard to the rights of others.

But we do not admit the right: for if this be a Christian right, it is an equal and an inalienable right. Now if the liberty of propagating one's own opinions be the right of a Christian, then every man, woman, and child in Christ's church has a right to propagate his or her opinions, and to complain if that right be not respected by all the Christian community. And as there is no restriction as to the number or magnitude of subjects on which opinions may be formed, there can be no limitation of the number of opinions that may be offered for adoption or propagation; and thus the whole earthly pilgrimage of the church may be occupied in the discussion of such opinions.

Again, if such be the right of all, it is the *duty* of all to listen and judge; for all Christian rights oblige to corresponding duties. If only one person in a church has a right to propagate his opinions, it is the duty of all the rest to listen to him; for that the very nature of the right implies. But if all have the right in question, then all are obliged in turn to propagate his own opi-

Digitized by Google

nion on any one or all of the ten thousand topics on which a person may form an opinion: for be it observed, the dominions of opinion are larger than the dominions of knowledge and faith united.

We are therefore rationally and religiously compelled to deny any such right. *It is not the right of any one citizen of Christ's kingdom to propagate any opinion whatever, either in the public assembly or in private;* consequently it is not the duty of all, nor of any one, to listen to an opinionist in his efforts to dogmatize or establish his opinions. This is an important point, and we state it confidently and boldly.

Opinions in religion can have no authority. Precepts, promises, and threatenings, sanctioned by Omnipotence, are the weapons of the Holy Spirit. Men may form opinions and walk by them on all subjects of mere temporal concern, in the absence of Divine Revelation. But to walk by opinions rather than faith, or in opposition to faith, is effectually to make the Book of God of no authority. Moreover, in the decisions of that volume, he that propagates an opinion and seeks to attach persons to it, or to himself on account of it, is a factionist in embryo, in infancy, or in manhood.

Unless this matter is better understood it will fare with us as with Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and other religious communities. We shall be broken to pieces as well as they. It is owing to the patience of contradiction and the great good sense of some of our more intelligent brethren, that schisms have not already appeared amongst us under the assumption that every Christian has a right to propagate his opinions. While it is conceded that on some matters we have all liberty to form opinions, and, if asked for them, to express them; we must regard this as very different from the right to propagate our speculations, instead of practising the precepts of the gospel.

There are two things hard to be uttered:—The first is, "I have erred;" the second, "I am ignorant." A haughty spirit, rather than say the former, will frame many an excuse for himself; and rather than acknowledge the latter, he will advance many a speculation. Yet it is both piety and wisdom to acknowledge an error, when guilty; and, in the absence of revelation clear and explicit, it is our privilege to be ignorant and to acknowledge it!

Digitized by Google

Some of our brethren to this very hour, cannot perceive the difference between what is faith and what is opinion. Even one of our much-valued correspondents, who writes many excellent things, seems to have been off his guard and to have fallen palpably into the same error. We shall quote a recent letter of his from the "*Primitive Christian*," as a text, because we expect as much patience and candor from brother Winans as from any other brother:—

"JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, June 13, 1837.

"*Dear brother Shepard*,—

In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, I find that differences in opinion still continue to alienate brethren, and that in some sense opinion is made the bond of union. This state of things exists to a greater extent than we are fully aware of, and it is not confined to the illiterate, but extends through all grades of intelligence. Therefore, there is evidently a fault among us; for while we teach that all men have the right to think and judge for themselves in religious matters, still we condemn them for doing so, provided their conclusions differ from our own.

"One man thinks there is an intermediate state of consciousness between death and the resurrection; another thinks that all consciousness, and susceptibility of pain or pleasure ceases at death. One man thinks there are three resurrections of the dead spoken of in the Scriptures, one past, including the saints who died in the faith, preceding the coming of the Messiah; another, of the saints who die in the faith between the first and second comings of Christ; and another of all the dead both great and small, who never heard of a Saviour; this last to take place at the end of the next dispensation or millennium. Another thinks there is but one resurrection of the dead, which immediately precedes the judgment. Another thinks that the spirits of those who die go immediately to heaven or hell, and that their bodies follow at the resurrection. And another thinks that the wicked are not raised at all, or he divides them into two classes, such as have heard the Prophets or Apostles, or both, and such as have not heard either: the former of which will be raised and the latter not. And another thinks that there is no such thing as the spirits of men separate from their bodies.

"But all of these men believe the testimony of God relative to his son Jesus Christ, and are willing to obey him in all things.

"These things being so, they should cease to speak evil of one another, and not corrupt their good manners by calling each other by ugly names.

"Affectionately yours, "M. WINANS."

Digitized by Google

This letter is surely sufficiently latitudinarian for the taste of this generation. But is it not loose in all its joints, and halt into the bargain? "The right to think and judge for themselves in religious matters," is here confounded with "the right to propagate one's own opinions." These are very different matters.—The right to think and judge for one's self respects not opinions, but faith, precepts, promises, and threatenings. We do not condemn any one for thinking and judging for himself on faith and duty; but we do dissent from him, and perhaps censure him too, who insists upon propagating his own opinions as aforesaid.

But our principal objection to this letter is, that it confounds opinion and faith. One man thinks, another man thinks, &c. &c. And what do they think? "One man *thinks* there will be a resurrection of all the dead, both small and great"! and another "*thinks* that the wicked are not raised at all"! &c. &c. Yes, indeed, one man thinks there will be no punishment after death, and another thinks that the wicked shall be punished after death! This is charitable enough! It is all *I think* and "*he thinks.*" But, according to Paul, "there shall be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust;" and he that *thinks* differently, has erred not in opinion; but, as Paul says, "he errs concerning *the faith.*" So far he denies the faith and contradicts the Apostle. "But all these men," concludes our charitable brother Winans, all these *thinkers*, "believe the testimony of God relative to his son Jesus Christ." Yes! and one man thinks that sprinkling is as good as dipping, and another thinks that an infant is as proper a subject of baptism as a believing adult; and one thinks Jesus Christ is a mere man, and another thinks him to be a super-angelic being, and a third thinks him to be the only begotten Son of God, as fully possessed of divinity as his Father; and so it is all *I think.* No man "believes the testimony of God relative to his son Jesus Christ" who does not believe all that testimony: and it is a part of that testimony that Jesus Christ always spoke the truth. Now to believe the testimony of God, is to believe the testimony of Jesus; and Jesus has said, that all that are in the graves shall come forth: they that have done good and they that have done evil! Are not evil-doers the wicked? Yet our charitable brother regards him who *thinks* that only some of the dead shall hear

Digitized by Google

Christ's voice and come forth from the grave, as only differing in opinion from himself, who believes on the word of the Son of God, that all the dead shall be raised!!! A single specimen is all that we select on the present occasion, to call attention to this point.

In a little time we shall have all the opinions of eighteen centuries under discussion, unless we learn that we have no right nor license to seek to be wise above what is written. But that is not the worst of it. If it be the duty of the present generation to canvass the ten thousand notions of two thousand years, it will equally devolve upon our children and their children, for a thousand generations, to go over the same ground—if, indeed, God would permit this state of things so long to continue.

We must, I repeat it, set our faces against this course, or we will all repent it. The weakest are generally the most dogmatical; and those who know the least, the most positive and overbearing; and therefore there is no convincing them: nothing to be hoped from strifes of opinions; for the chorus will ever be, "My opinion is as good as thine," and "Am not I as infallible as thou?"

But we sin against the teaching of the Apostles if we do not abandon this course. Paul enjoins that we "give not heed to *fables*"—"to endless genealogies"—"that he that consents not to the doctrine which is according to godliness, is proud, self-opinionated, doting, or sick about questions, and debates of words; from which come envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings," &c.—"Avoid profane and vain babblings, oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred, not in opinion, but from the faith." He reiterates these precepts in his two epistles to Timothy: "Shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase to more ungodliness, and their word will eat like a canker. Of this class are Hymeneus and Philetus," (men of science!) "who concerning" opinions! nay, "*the truth* have erred, saying that the resurrection is past *already*, and have *overthrown the faith of some.*" This gives a key to the whole chapter of vain babblings, &c. Hence said the Apostle, "Foolish and *untaught* questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes."

These untaught questions are precisely questions about opinions; and that they do gender strife we have proof from brother

Digitized by Google

Winans, who avows that "differences in opinion"—that is, in untaught questions, when persons become dogmatical of course—"still continue to alienate brethren." Paul, it seems, was alienated from Hymeneus and Philetus for affirming an opinion concerning the resurrection being in some sense or in some part already past. It was but an *opinion*, yet it "overthrew *the faith* of some."

I presume it will require a good deal of plain showing to make this matter of *dogmatizing* and of *opinionism* evident to all. We shall, however, devote an essay or two to the subject. I have no doubt but all partyism now in Protestant Christendom, and most of the errors too, grew out of neglect of the scriptures quoted from Paul, and a misunderstanding of *the faith* and of untaught questions.

A. C.

SECTARIANISM.

To all those who have a mind *to work for the Lord.*

Brethren! may God speed your endeavors to do good in breaking down the walls of Babylon which surround the temple of Belus, the hanging gardens, the terraces, the cascades, the palaces, the riches, and the magnificence of the city—the idolatrous city of Babylon! She boasts of her age, her strength, and her glory; she sits as a Queen, and says, 'I shall never *see* sorrow;' she revels upon her delicacies, and fattens upon her goodly things; she vainly imagines that her walls and towers, her lakes and embankments will secure her from any successful attack; and she disdainfully hurls defiance at her adversaries without. But strong is the Lord God who judges her! Her gates of brass shall not always be barred; her rivers shall not always flow on undisturbed; the might of her armies and the strength of her allies shall not always be impregnable; her treasures of darkness shall not always be concealed; the people of God shall not always be confined within her accursed walls; their harps shall not forever hang upon the willows, nor shall the sacred vessels of her ministry be polluted by the impiety and licentiousnes of her nobles and her princes.

Digitized by Google

Ancient Babylon was of vast extent, and her tributaries were numerous. She was not built in a day: so with SECTARIANISM. We Protestants are looking exclusively at Rome, at Papal Rome! for the spiritual Babylon. I have no doubt but that she is in the enclosure. She owns the richest and the most elegant part of the city. The temple of Belus also is hers; the chief streets, the magnificent palaces, where the Merchants, the Lawyers, the D. Ds., the Princes, the Nobles, the Reverends, the Right Reverends, the Bishops, the Arch-Bishops, the Prelates, the Cardinals, the Popes reside, principally belong to her. But if Rome, spiritual Rome is the *mother* of harlots, where are her *daughters?* Doubtless by her side! They live near her, and have been educated by her. They are all to be found inhabiting some part of the city. They may not possess the same amount of wealth, or of attractions; they may not be so corrupt or debased, as vile and besotted; they may not be as loud and as clamorous, and as deceitful as their mother: but they have decked their couches—their *pews*, with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with fine linen of Egypt; they have perfumed their beds with myrrh, with aloes, and cinnamon; they use flattering speech, and many have been snared and caught in their toils; many have been cast down and wounded; yea, strong men have even been slain by them. Their house is the way to hades, going down to the chambers of death.

If there is any proposition that is capable of being sustained from the pages of the Word of God, this one can be sustained—That the present sectarian condition of the Christian church is the mystic Babylon of the New Testament, with Rome in its *centre*, or at its head. This proposition can be sustained by arguments drawn from prophecy, from types, from analogies, and from facts found spread out on the pages of the Old and New Testaments, and from sacred and profane history.

Now, as Cyrus gave the proclamation to the people of God, to go out of the ancient city of Babylon; so Jesus has given command to all his people to *come* out of spiritual Babylon. Ezra i: Rev. xvii. 18. All those in whom is the Spirit of God, and who desire to rebuild the broken and dilapidated walls and temple of Jerusalem, (the mother of all Christians,) will go out, or ought

Digitized by Google

immediately to escape. If they do not, they must partake of her plagues.

Brethren, let us sound the alarm; let us blow the silver trumpet of salvation to the enslaved people; let us not be afraid to show Jacob their sins, and Israel their transgressions. Would to God I had the voice of a strong-lunged angel, that I might blow a blast that would penetrate the leaden ears of the thoughtless and insecure—that I might arouse, as from the sleep of death, those who dream that there is *peace* when there is no peace.

JAMES CHALLEN.

Lexington, July 18, 1837.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AND PRESIDENT WOODS.

Few of our readers comparatively, perhaps, may have been informed that the University of Alabama has been almost literally broken up through the insubordination of the students.—This is, in the South and South-West, becoming more and more the misfortune of the high schools and colleges. Parental authority at home and the authority of tutors and guardians abroad, are, it would seem, by far too feeble for the "fierce democracy" of the young gentlemen who are accustomed to command from the cradle their inferiors indeed in color, but their superiors in years. And indeed the contagion is beginning to spread beyond the immediate precincts of "the mingled people." Family government out of New England is a very democratic administration. The sovereign children, like "the sovereign people," are often—too often, alas! appealed to in vain. This government parental so frequently failing, and consequently the scholastic and academic government following so closely in its train, according to all Greek, and Roman, and French augury, is ominous of the momentary duration of all our State governments: for as certain as the seasons of the year revolve, and as the waters return to the ocean which originate from it, so certain it is that insubordination to parents and teachers is wholly incompatible with subordination to civil authority. Civil or political authority,

Digitized by Google

armed with all its terrors, is the feeblest of the three. When the two former have failed, *it* must inevitably fail; and therefore when family government is neglected and the academic set at naught, parchment governments and political authorities will in a few years crumble down to dust and leave the memorial of their follies as their richest legacy to posterity. Unless reformation in family government be speedily effected, the best days of this Republic are numbered; and this reformation cannot be effected without religion. No government of any sort—family, academic, or political, can subsist without religion, true or false. They never have—they never can—they never will. We have only to choose between the two—religion or anarchy; and between the true and the false in religion. Religion is the cement of society; and we shall as soon make our houses of brick stand without mortar, as any government stand without the restraints of conscience and the fear of God.

From the public prints we learn that it has been at the hazard of the reputation and literary and moral standing of the Faculty of the University of Alabama, that attempts at order and good government have been made. The rebellious and mutinous students, the expelled young *gentlemen*, have had their gallant advocates and friends, who have sought to blast the fair fame of President Woods and the learned Faculty of the University.—Happily, however, for Mr. Woods, he had earned a reputation for literary eminence and moral worth before he left New England and the University of Transylvania, which was not to be blasted by the foul spirit of slander and revenge. With the President we ourselves have had the pleasure of some acquaintance while he labored to build up the dilapidated fortunes of Transylvania; and therefore we are the more surprised at the late attempts of the insubordinates and their allies to calumniate his standing with the community.

We were, however, pleased to observe in a late Tuscaloosa paper, "*The Flag of the Union*," that the Trustees of the University have righteously interposed and defended the Faculty from the reckless assaults of their enemies. The following extracts from the proceedings of the Board of Trustees at their late meeting, places these matters as we have no doubt they ought to be, before the community:—

Digitized by Google

"UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA.—The following are a part of the proceedings of the Board of Trustees of this Institution, at their late meeting:—

'*Resolved*, That the Board are well satisfied with the manner in which the Faculty have discharged their official duties since the last meeting of the Board.

'*Resolved*, That the Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama approve the conduct of the Faculty in relation to the suspension of the students in April last.

'Adopted 14th July, 1837.

'M. D. WILLIAMS, *Secretary*.'

"Extract from the Report of the Special Committee of Investigation on the affairs of the University, of which committee the late Governor Gayle was Chairman, and which Report has been adopted and published by the Board of Trustees:—

'These disturbances which have reflected so much discredit upon the University, and still more upon those who produced them, can, in no wise, be attributed to the Faculty. On the contrary, in the opinion of the committee, they adopted the best means to prevent them; and, after their occurrence, pursued the most prudent course to suppress them. The committee cannot too much admire the firmness which characterized the conduct of the Faculty, through the whole of these disgraceful riots—nor can they withhold the expression of their approbation at the forbearance with which they received the insults, abuse, and open assaults of these young men, who, without any adequate cause, have inflicted a deep and lasting wound on an Institution which is the fondest hope of the parent, and the proudest boast of the country.

'After the most diligent inquiry, the committee are gratified at being able to state, that the President of the University, and the learned Professors with whom he is associated, since the last meeting of the Board, have discharged their arduous and complicated duties, with unremitted zeal and industry, and in a manner altogether satisfactory to the committee. The ability with which they have executed their official duties; their efforts to uphold the government of the University during the late disturbances; to execute its laws; and to maintain the discipline which those laws were enacted to establish, entitle them to great credit, and cannot fail to call forth the approbation of the public generally, and especially of that portion which looks to the Institution as the great nursery of science, literature, and virtue, which is to qualify our sons to be useful citizens, and to send forth bands of young men whose genius and attainments will make the State rejoice to acknowledge them as her lawgivers and her rulers.

'JOHN GAYLE,
Chairman of the Committee of Investigation.'

"At the request of President Woods, the Trustees went into an election of a successor to himself as President of the University; and the Rev. Basil Manly, D. D., of Charleston, South Carolina, was unanimously elected. President Woods has consented, at the request of the Trustees, to continue in his present office until the end of the present year, by which time it is supposed his successor will be ready to enter upon its duties."

Digitized by Google

The following allusions to parental indulgence, quoted from the Report of the Committee of Investigation, satisfactorily explains the whole causes of such insubordination, as well as presents a most appalling picture of the degeneracy of the age:—

"The committee are fully persuaded that the late, as well as all former disturbances, had their origin neither in the government and laws of the University, nor in the manner of executing the laws. The true foundation of these disturbances, and all the causes which have conspired to bring the University to its present condition, is to be looked for elsewhere.

"The first to which the committee will refer, is the means which parents afford their sons, on sending them to the University, of supplying themselves with every thing which the extravagance or vices of the times have brought into use. These means, instead of guarding and protecting them from the temptations which are constantly spread before them, operate as an inducement to go in their way, and actually to embrace them. It is too common with parents to give their sons extensive, and often unlimited credit in Tuscaloosa, and to furnish them with considerable sums of money, which their wants and comforts do not require. Prone, as young men are, to participate in the pleasures and amusements of what is denominated fashionable life, and to plunge into its excesses too, it is not to be wondered at that, thus supplied, they neglect their studies, and become impatient of the restraints and discipline of the University. It cannot have escaped observation that many of the sons of wealthy parents, on their arrival here, seem to entertain the opinion that they are entering on a theatre where they are to appear as men of the world; and their first preparation for college life is the procurement of costly and extravagant wardrobes, liberal supplies from the best jewelry establishments, and then the indispensable appendages of dirks, pistols, Bowie knives, &c. Thus equipped, it cannot be expected that they would do otherwise than erect the standard of rebellion at the first efforts of the Faculty to subject them to the restraints imposed by the laws of the University. No persuasion could induce them to enter upon, and pursue with diligence, the studies prescribed by the Trustees and Faculty."

If these most disastrous outbreakings in Colleges and Universities will not rouse this community to take a greater interest in the moral culture of youth, and in a more religious and rational family government than at present obtains, we shall not long have to boast before the world of our free, rational, and excellent political institutions. A. C.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSIONS—*No. I.*

Brother Campbell,

The *amaurosis*, or debility of the nerve of the eye, which induced me to ramble abroad, in order, as it were, to rest my eyes by *tiring* other organs, is in some measure relieved. This remedy, however, not having as yet proved entirely effectual, I avail myself of the aid of an amanuensis to put upon paper a few rambling thoughts or recollections of my route.

After experiencing the pain of parting with my family and friends, I set out, as you are already aware, on Friday the 9th of June, for the state of Kentucky. As I crossed the beautiful Ohio and proceeded on my journey, I could not but feel sensible of the force of those attachments by which we are connected with the persons and the places that we love. Ah! we do not fully know the strength of those ties which bind us to our homes, until we are compelled to put it to the test. After all, however, I am not sure but that the circle of our affections becomes too contracted when we remain constantly at home. We begin, perhaps, to live too much for ourselves; to forget the Saviour's definition of "my neighbor," and lose sight of the expansive benevolence and philanthropy of the gospel. The longer too we stay within the immediate influence of our domestic relations, the stronger becomes the web which is woven around us, so that it is at length almost impossible for us to disengage ourselves. Indeed, the propriety of attempting to do so, comes at length to be a question, the negative of which our inclinations can almost prove from the scriptures themselves. For, while it will be admitted by all that the inspired volume commands the wife to be a 'keeper at home,' it will be urged with no little plausibility, and upon the same authority, that the husband must 'cleave to his wife.' From this dilemma I must leave it to your superior powers of reasoning to escape by means of logic; as for me, since the more we feel the less we reason, I can at present get out of it only by the power and speed of my horse. In this mode of procedure, however, I am kept not a little in countenance by the example of one of those who have attained among men the rare distinction of being surnamed Great;—him, I mean, who, to fulfil the oracle, *untied* the Gordian knot by *cutting* it with his sword!

Digitized by Google

Of my horse, I do not feel sufficiently in the heroic mood to give you a description; nor do I know that it would be in place, seeing that he is not a *hobby*-horse. If indeed he were a *hobby*-horse, and of as good *wind* and bottom as those called Opinionism and Materialism seem to be, I might fill many pages in praising his excellent qualities, and get praised myself at last. Yet to confess the truth, I think he is really of more value than both the aforesaid *hobbies* put together. Since, however, he is only a *horse*, suffice it to say, that his name is Barny, doubtless an abbreviation of Barnabas; which, being interpreted, signifies *a son of consolation.* But lest the mention of even this should seem inconsistent with gravity, (for which you know I have an undoubted reputation,) I beg leave to adduce this fact as evidence against an assertion of the grave and eminent Dr. Rush, in a tract which you published in the July number of the Harbinger, p. 300, to wit: 'that while the names of the kings and emperors of Rome are now given chiefly to *horses* and *dogs*, scripture names are confined only to the human species.'

And now, since I am fairly on the way, as I advance through the fertile state of Ohio, and perceive how liberally the Beneficent Author of the Universe has dispensed his favors here as he has also with us; when I see the pure fountains of water gushing forth from the hills, along whose sides the road winds with gentle slope; the deep green woods with their varied stores of timber; the verdant meadows, and the extensive fields of Indian corn, which stretches forth its long and varnished leaves to receive the genial rays of the sun: when I consider the different creatures which he has presented to man;—the finny tribes which inhabit the waters; the fowls of the air; the herds and flocks which feed in the rich pastures; and think of the innumerable influences and unceasing care which more than supply the wants of all, so that the earth is indeed "filled with the goodness of the Lord:" and when, on the other hand, I reflect how little men regard the kindness of their Benefactor, though even the 'ox knows his owner and the ass his master's crib,' I cannot but think that ingratitude is the most degrading of all vices, and man the most ungrateful of all creatures.

Selfishness seems to be the prevailing passion. For, while, in

Digitized by Google

the neat and flourishing villages and towns throughout our land, men are seen lounging about bar-rooms and sipping the inebriating cup; or contending with each other in courts of law for rights, titles, and possessions; or engaging in the speculations and peculations of the day; the inhabitants of the country, among whom Virtue, when banished from the city, is said by the ancients, to have left the last traces of her presence,—even they are seeking to add field to field, and complaining of the insufficiency of their crops. Nay, they even presume to arraign the wisdom and the benevolence of the Divine Being. If we have a few days dry weather, "Ah!" they exclaim, "the drought is destroying all the fruit of our labors." If showers of rain continue for a few days in succession, "Alas!" they cry, "our corn will be smothered with weeds, and our wheat will undoubtedly have the rust." Yet after all, when the harvest moon goes up the sky, and completes her revolution, the horn of Plenty also is filled, and the lap of Ceres can contain no more. In plain language, the husbandmen have every year more than they can consume. For although they, like the rest of the world, (as our beloved brother C—p. preaches, and Franklin and other sages have decided,) eat at least twice as much as they ought, yet they cannot devour it all, but are compelled after supplying all their wants, to sell a large surplus to the highest bidder!

There is much fine land in Ohio, and that portion of the state through which my present course lies, is in many places extremely beautiful. How rich is the valley of the Muskingum! And yet how far superior that through which the Sciota rolls its waters! It is a delightful country around Lancaster, and more particularly around the charming village of Tarleton and the flourishing town of Chillicothe. Here the rich soil yields a hundred fold. And as I travel onward, and view the orchards laden with fruit; the rows of peach trees bending beneath their burden, and the swarms of industrious bees seeking additional room to store up their fragrant honey: when I inhale the delicious odor of fields which the Lord hath blessed, borne on every breeze; and see, stretching on the right hand and on the left, wide tracts of level land covered with the finest crops of wheat and rye, here whitening to harvest, and there of deeper hue—

Digitized by Google

"Where play the waves o'er golden grain,
"Like mimic billows of the main"—

I cannot but think of last Spring, when, just about the time the frogs began to croak, the farmers commenced their usual complaint of 'blasted hopes and withered joys,' and when they would become almost angry if one ventured to predict they would have enough to eat. But at length, as a mother stills her squalling babes, our heavenly Father has stopped their mouths by filling them with food.

And now after a change has been produced, to themselves almost miraculous; and showers of rain from heaven have caused those fields which seemed naked and bare, to bring forth abundantly, how seldom do we hear the accents of gratitude, or the voice of praise ascending to the Bountiful Giver of all good! How little contrition for that want of confidence in God, which is so discreditable to man whom he loves so well, and for whom he cares so much, that he has even counted the hairs upon his head! How much better it would be if presumptuous man would humble himself before the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and confess at once his dependence, his ignorance and his folly, and the incomprehensible power and glory of the Almighty. "Every thing," says Labruyere, "is great and wonderful in nature,—there is nothing which does not bear the mark of the workman, in some corner; the very irregular and imperfect things which we sometimes observe, imply regularity and perfection. Vain and presumptuous man! make a worm, which you trample under foot and despise: you are afraid of a toad; make a toad if you can. How excellent a master of his art he is who fabricates those things which men not only admire, but fear! I do not require you to show your skill in making a man of sense, a handsome man, or a beautiful woman; the undertaking is too hard and unequal: try only to make a deformed creature, an ideot, a monster, and I am content.

"Ye kings, monarchs, potentates, sacred majesties! have I given you all your pompous titles? Ye great, high, and mighty, and perhaps shortly almighty lords! we poor men stand in need of, for the ripening of our harvest, a little rain, or, what is less, a little dew; make it for us, we beseech you: send down upon the face of the earth but one drop of water."

Digitized by Google

Depend upon it, there is much Atheism in the community—more than is commonly supposed. True, indeed, there are few who will avow it openly, because it is a disbelief unpopular and discreditable. Yet I am confident there are now, as in the days of David, many fools who say *in their heart*, There is no God. I cannot upon any other hypothesis explain the insensibility manifested by men to the claims of the gospel, believing as I do that there is no island nor anchorage between the shores of Deism and those of Christianity. In other words, that there is no point where reason can rest between the cordial and sincere reception of the truth concerning God, and an acknowledgment of the divine mission of his Son. And what are all these murmurings and disputings against the providence of God, but so many indications of that Epicurean theology, which (at least for all practical purposes) amounts to downright Atheism? Or what is the unthankfulness and ingratitude of men, but an evidence that God is not in their thoughts, nor recognized by them as the giver of their blessings? Or, finally, what is the system of Owen which has so many advocates, but Atheism in a fashionable guise?

In passing through the village of C—, I happened to have a conversation with one of the pupils of the master just named; and while in accordance with the principles he had received, he affected a total ignorance upon the whole subject of spiritual existence, it was easy to perceive that the pretence of being governed entirely by the evidence received through the five senses, was mainly for the purpose of rejecting all information concerning God; and that this modest ignorance is but a cloak for disbelief.

He professed to know nothing at all about God; and argued, 'that it was much more reasonable and accordant with evidence to suppose that the earth is the source of our life and our intelligence, as well as of our bodies, and, in short, of every thing which exists upon its surface, than to believe in the existence of God.' Certainly then, said I, we ought to treat the earth with more respect than to tread upon her, to dig into her bowels, or tear her bosom with the plough. Nay, upon these principles we should even pay her divine honors. For, if we respect intelligence, power, skill, wisdom, and goodness among men, certainly the giver of all these attributes must be worthy of supreme regard.

Digitized by Google

As I proceeded on my way, I could not help reflecting upon the absurdity of the sceptical conclusion. It is to suppose that the earth can give that which it does not itself possess,—organization, sensation, life, intelligence. It is to disregard the most imperative dictate of reason, and, in short, to repudiate reason altogether; for there is no reason, if it be not reason that every effect must have a sufficient cause. They, however, here most unreasonably reject the testimony of Nature, and cease to reason as in other cases, from effect to cause. They do not assign, as reason requires, a sufficient cause; but in supposing that the earth can give intelligence, order, and harmony, and produce the inimitable arrangement and adaptations which we observe, they receive an absurdity even greater than if they were to believe that a "learned pig" excavated and formed the Ohio canal with all its locks and aqueducts; or that some potent snail constructed the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, along which cars may travel at the rate of 30 miles an hour!

But in the mean time the sun, moon, and stars are forgotten. Not having faith, the sceptic of course cannot tell whether or not 'things which are seen were made of things which do appear,' and it is of no use to ask him if the earth made the sun; or the sun, the moon; or the moon, the stars. One thing, however, he ought to *know*,—that *mother Earth* could not produce a single blade of grass, nor give suck to one of her progeny, without the genial influence of the sun. For when his face is turned away but a little, as in the winter season, her bosom is as the flinty rock: her offspring perishes; the vegetable kingdom is dead; the tuneful, dumb: nay, she herself is deprived of life, the wintry winds sigh forth her requiem, and her winding-sheet is the cold encircling snow! He should *know* also that the earth and the sun together could produce nothing without the showers of rain from heaven and the various forces of attraction, gravitation, &c. by means of which the operations of nature are performed.

If, then, we make a goddess of the earth, and deify the dust on which we tread, consistency will make a deity also of the sun which warms, and the air which breathes upon it and infuses life into its productions. If we have our Terra, we must have also

Digitized by Google

our Phœbus and our Jupiter Pluvius. We must pay divine honors to the stormy Auster and the gentle Aura. In short, we must perform the ceremony of apotheosis for every principle and influence in creation, whether it be atmospheric or chemical, electric or magnetic, terrestrial or celestial, until we have, as in the days of Hesiod, thirty thousand divinities; and then we will be just prepared like the Athenians of old, to erect an altar to the UNKNOWN GOD.

If such an altar did not, such an inscription at least would suit our modern sceptic well. For, truly, in professing to be governed by the evidence of sense alone, he prides himself upon his ignorance of every thing beyond. He boasts, indeed, as much of his ignorance as other people do of their knowledge; and it is perhaps, after all, the best thing about him: for if we may judge of his knowledge by the social philosophy of a Robert Dale Owen, his knowledge is certainly more debasing than his ignorance; so true it is now, as formerly, when men have it in their power to know God, and do not glorify him as God, that he delivers them over to shameful passions, to dishonor their own bodies, and to act in derogation and defiance of the laws and dictates of that very Nature to which they pretend to pay so much deference. Nor are they less inconsistent when they favor the world with their systems of social improvement and plans of union: for while they reject divine knowledge, they are compelled to borrow from the divine record that boasted benevolence, justice, and philanthropy, upon which they depend for the acceptance of their schemes by the community:—like the fabled Prometheus, who is said by the ancients to have formed the image of a man, but was unable to animate it until he had stolen fire from heaven!

The sceptic puts himself at once beyond the reach of conviction. In rejecting every thing except sensible demonstration, he rejects the only evidence which the nature of the case admits. It was our mutual friend Mr. Waterman, who observed in one of his communications to you, 'that such a reasoner never could be convinced of the existence of his Creator, inasmuch as his own creation could not be to him a matter of experience.' He could never know who created him by his senses, unless we could suppose him to exercise his senses before he was possessed of them—to

Digitized by Google

stand by and see himself created! And it is equally obvious, that he could never know who created the universe; since the heavens and the earth; the air which we breathe; the present constitution of things, by which, and in which we exist—our dwelling-place in short, must of necessity have been created before we ourselves could have a being.

'But,' replies the sceptic, 'this doctrine respecting a Divine Being is too mysterious for me. I cannot understand it. What is God like? Who made him?'—He forgets the mystery of his own hypothesis, and that there can be no cause before a *First* Cause. Does he relieve the question from any obscurity by the darkness of his total ignorance; or furnish a clearer solution of it by the absurdity of his own conjecture that the inert and unintelligent earth communicated life and intelligence? No compound can be eternal, for its parts must have existed separately before they were united. The earth is a compound mass, consequently not existing from eternity, any more than the antidote of Mithridates which consisted of seventy-two ingredients. Who, then, made the world?

We indeed confess a great mystery in God, and we glory in it. It is because he is infinitely superior. That which comprehends must be greater than that which is comprehended; and he that can fully understand, must be greater than his own divinity. Our mystery is above reason—the sceptic's contrary to it. Ours is a natural, necessary, and rational one—theirs an extravagant, unnecessary, and absurd one. Ours is glorious and exalted—theirs contemptible and pitiful. Since, then, we must have a mystery, we do well to receive a great one. Let not the bed be so short that we cannot stretch ourselves upon it, nor the covering so narrow that we cannot wrap ourselves in it. If we must be blinded, let it be with *light* rather than with darkness. If we must be overwhelmed, let it be with *knowledge* rather than with ignorance. If we are to be lost, let it not be in the dark caverns of the earth, but in *the heavens—in glory ineffable—in God!* How reasonable, then, it is to refer the origin and subsistence of this Universal Frame, with all its immensity, grandeur, beauty, sublimity, order, variety, and unity, to a "Maker Omnipotent" —One capable of giving birth to such a system? How happify-

Digitized by Google

ing it is to be blessed with a true revelation of the being and attributes of such a Divinity, unspeakably glorious, and unchangeably perfect! It is as though we were transported from some gloomy valley to a lofty eminence, from whence we discern, on one hand, hills, valleys, and mountains growing fainter in the distance; and on the other, the mighty ocean stretching to the extreme verge of the horizon! Reason is delivered from the prison-house; imagination is rapt aloft, and the soul filled with joyful and sublime emotions. How comforting to be assured that God created the heavens and the earth, and to be informed that after his own image he made man—that Adam was "a son of God!"* How noble a lineage! How honorable a descent! How glorious the inheritance bestowed upon man in accordance with this high origin! "He hath put all things under his feet"! He is constituted monarch of all he surveys! How delightful, then, to throw ourselves on His goodness from whom we receive our being, and to depend upon Him for instruction, as the child commits himself to his parent and places the most implicit reliance upon those teachings which are dictated by affection. And, on the other hand, how debased or perverted must be the mind of him who can deface the ensigns armorial of the family of man; bury celestial hopes without one sigh; turn away from the worthiest objects of mortal ambition, and repress the dearest aspirations of the human heart!

You see how I ramble. But if I have not wearied you, I would remark farther, that the atheistic spirit which is in the community has been, in my judgment, greatly encouraged by the carelessness of those who are professedly religious; and more particularly within the last few years, during which the facilities of amassing wealth have been so great. Prosperity, indeed, seems to have pretty much the same effect upon a Christian that a calm at sea has upon a Dutch mariner, who furls his sails, ties up his rudder, gets drunk, and goes to sleep. The religious public have been too little addicted to the worship of God, and have failed to display that gratitude, piety, and spiritual-mindedness, for which they ought to have been distinguished. The hymn of praise and the voice of thanksgiving have been too seldom heard to ascend from their dwellings, and they have too often chimed in with the

* Luke iii. 38.

Digitized by Google

murmurings and querulousless of unbelievers. In some families, indeed, religious homage and instruction are wholly neglected, and children may grow up almost without knowing what God their parents worship.

It would go far towards correcting the unbelieving disposition of society, if believers would more freely and frequently confess their dependence upon God before their families and in their intercourse with the world, "giving thanks always for all things." There is too much *false* shame among Christians, and not shame enough of the proper kind. But I have no idea that gratitude should be expressed in *words* only. I do not know why an Ebenezer should not be occasionally set up; in other words, why Christians should not perform *actions* also to express their gratefulness on special occasions. Would it not be most becoming for one who had just returned from a long journey to appoint an evening and assemble his friends and neighbors to partake of a suitable repast, and rejoice with him socially and religiously? Or, for the farmer who has just gathered in his harvest, to fix upon a day for thanksgiving; send presents to the poor of the neighborhood; kill the fatted calf, and rejoice with his friends before the Lord? If the pious would by these, and many other acts dictated by a thankful spirit, boldly acknowledge the existence, superintendence, and goodness of God, they would greatly increase their own happiness, and aid in putting down the infidel spirit of the age.

But I am now at Maysville. In passing through Ohio I had the pleasure of seeing some members of the churches at Morristown, and Middletown, and some former acquaintances. These churches have been aided by the labors of brother Jones; and are now occasionally visited by brother Cook, whose zeal, prudence, and attention to the order of the churches, have greatly promoted the interests of the cause of Christ. Between Middletown and Maysville, a distance of about one hundred and eighty miles, I found not one single congregation of the ancient faith and practice. The people appear kind, intelligent, and industrious, and many of them pious, but needing a more perfect knowledge of the Christian Institution.

R. R.

Digitized by Google

THE following Proclamation by the young Queen of England is worthy of being preserved as a testimony in favor of righteousness and virtue. It is gratifying to see those high in power uniting their influence with that of law to suppress vice and profligacy. Rulers indeed are "appointed for the punishment of evil doers and for the praise of those who do well;" and in fulfilling these duties they show their regard for the best interests of the people. All who wish well to the community and to themselves, are bound to aid in putting down iniquity, and in sustaining the laws which are "made for the lawless." Sin, taught by selfishness to trample on the rights of others, breaks down the sacred defences of society, and strikes at the bosom of every man. He loves men best who hates sin most. That person is GOD the *Supreme Ruler* of the Universe. R. R.

PROCLAMATION BY THE QUEEN,

For the encouragement of piety and virtue, and for the preventing and punishing of vice, profaneness, and immorality.

VICTORIA R.

We most seriously and religiously consider that it is an indispensable duty on us to be careful above all other things, to preserve and advance the honor and service of Almighty God, and to discourage and suppress all vice, profaneness, debauchery, and immorality, which are so highly displeasing to God, so great a reproach to our religion and government, and by means of the frequent ill examples of the practices thereof have so fatal a tendency to the corruption of many of our loving subjects, otherwise religiously and virtuously disposed, and which (if not timely remedied) may justly draw down the divine vengeance on us and our kingdom; we also humbly acknowledge that we cannot expect the blessing and goodness of Almighty God (by whom Kings and Queens reign, and on whom we entirely rely) to make our reign happy and prosperous both to ourselves and our people, without a religious observance of God's holy laws: to the intent, therefore, that religion, piety, and good manners may, according to our most hearty desire, flourish and increase under our administration and government, we have thought fit, by the advice of our privy council, to issue this our royal proclamation, and do hereby declare our royal purpose and resolution to discountenance and punish all manner of vice, profaneness, and immorality, in all persons of whatsoever degree or quality within our realm, and particularly in such as are employed near our royal person; and that, for the encouragement of religion and morality, we will, upon all occasions, distinguish persons of piety and virtue by

Digitized by Google

marks of our royal favor; and we do expect and require that all persons of honor, or in places of authority, will give good example by their own virtue and piety, and to their utmost contribute to the discountenancing persons of dissolute and debauched lives, that they, being reduced by that means to shame and contempt for their loose and evil actions and behaviour, may be thereby also enforced the sooner to reform their ill habits and practices, and that the visible displeasure of good men towards them may (as far as it is possible) supply what the laws (probably) cannot altogether prevent. And we do hereby strictly enjoin and prohibit all our loving subjects, of what degree or quality soever, from playing on the Lord's day at dice, cards, or any other game whatsoever, either in public or private houses, or other place or places whatever. And we do hereby require and command them, and every one of them, decently and reverently to attend the worship of God on every Lord's day, on pain of our highest displeasure, and of being proceeded against with the utmost rigor that may be by law. And for the more effectual reforming all such persons, who, by reason of ther dissolute lives and conversations, are a scandal to our kingdom, our pleasure is, and we do hereby charge and command all our judges, mayors, sheriffs, justices of the peace, and all other officers and ministers, both ecclesiastical and civil, and all other subjects whom it may concern, to be very vigilant and strict in the discovery and the effectual prosecution and punishment of all persons who shall be guilty of excessive drinking, blasphemy, profane swearing and cursing, lewdness, profanation of the Lord's day, or other dissolute, immoral, or disorderly practices, and that they take care also effectually to suppress all public gaming-houses and places, and other lewd and disorderly houses; and to put in execution the statute made in the 29th year of the reign of the late King Charles II., entitled, "An act for the better observation of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday;" and also so much of an act of Parliament made in the 9th year of the reign of the late King William III., entitled, "An act to the more effectual suppressing of blasphemy and profaneness," as is now in force; and all other laws now in force for the punishing and suppressing any of the vices aforesaid, and also to suppress and prevent all gaming whatever, in public or private houses on the Lord's day; and likewise that they take effectual care to prevent all persons keeping taverns, chocolate houses, coffee houses, or other public houses whatever, from selling wine, chocolate, coffee, ale, beer, or other liquors, or receiving or permitting guests to be or remain in such their houses in the time of divine service on the Lord's day, as they will answer it to Almighty God, and upon pain of our highest displeasure. And for the more effectual proceeding herein, we do hereby direct

Digitized by Google

and command all our judges of assize and justices of the peace to give strict charges at their respective assizes and sessions for the due prosecution and punishment of all persons that shall presume to offend in any of the kind aforesaid; and also of all persons that, contrary to their duty, shall be remiss or negligent in putting the said laws in execution; and that they do, at their respective assizes and quarter sessions of the place, cause this our royal proclamation to be publicly read in open court immediately before the charge is given. And we hereby further charge and command every minister in his respective parish church or chapel to read or cause to be read this our royal proclamation at least four times in every year, immediately after divine service, and to incite and stir up their respective auditories to the practice of piety and virtue.

Discussion of Universalism.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

No. IX.

UTICA, N. Y. August 12, 1837.

Dear Sir—YOURS of the 1st inst. reached me yesterday. It is useless to waste more time about the vastness of your concessions.

2—You admit that you had been wide from the question before us, when you say that my 2d and 3d paragraphs, which directly met what you had written, had no bearing on the question. I hope in future you will observe more strictly your own rule to keep to the question.

3—You attempt to evade my retort of your own charge of the proposed questions' stultifying [nullifying you now have it] each other, is a lame effort. You pretend that your questions were all *homogeneous; either* of which would have been sufficient to cover the ground of difference between us, but mine were *heterogeneous*, compelling us to travel over more ground than necessary. Is it possible you can be serious in this? If your first question, 'Is there any punishment for sin?' had been settled in the affirmative, would you not then have desired a discussion of your next, viz. 'Is that punishment present or future?' and so on with the third and fourth questions? And yet you would persuade our readers that you only meant to give me the option of selecting *one* out of four or five questions! Admirable consistency!

4—If your strongest ramparts fall, you need not 'lay the flattering unction to your soul,' that your citadel will be spared. It will be time enough for me to advance further proof of my fourth proposition, when you have disposed of that brought forward in my first letter, or done any thing towards establishing the affirmative of your own side.

5—All you say in your 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th paragraphs, is wide of the mark. Unfortunately for my learned and acute opponent, it is an entire misapprehension (whether intentional or unin-

Digitized by Google

tentional, I know not,) of the views and arguments of Universalists generally, and certainly of my own. Certainly I have never argued, nor known any Universalist to argue, that, because *gehenna originally meant the valley of Hinnom, therefore it cannot represent a state of punishment after death in another world.* No, sir, such are not the arguments of Universalists. And all your fine syllogisms, based on this supposition, are, like the fragrance of a rose in the wilderness, wasted upon the desert air. We say, sir, that *gehenna* originally and literally meant the *valley of Hinnom.* This you admit. We further say, that in process of time, *gehenna*, or the *valley of Hinnom*, and *tophet*, another term for the same thing, were used in the Old Testament figuratively to set forth the temporal but severe judgments coming upon the Jews. The learned Schleusner, in his Lexicon, (and with him agree the most eminent critics,) *in voce gehenna*, says, "As a continual fire was necessary to consume the substances, [carcasses of animals and of desperate criminals,] lest the air should be infected by putrefaction, and as there were always worms feeding on the remaining fragments, [see Isa. lxvi. 24.] it hence came to pass that *every kind of punishment, and particularly every ignominious kind of death, was called by the name of gehenna.*' He refers to Matth. v. 22.—'SHALL BE IN DANGER OF A GEHENNA FIRE—i. e.' he says, 'SHALL BE WORTHY OF AN IGNOMINIOUS DEATH.' See as confirmation of the justness of this definition, Jer. vii. 25. to the end, and viii. 1, 2, 3, and the whole of the 19th chapter of Jeremiah. Also, Isaiah xxx. 27—33, and xxxi. 1—5. The reader is requested carefully to examine all these places.

6—Such being the acknowledged meaning and uses of the VALLEY OF HINNOM, in the Old Testament, what reason have we to suppose it was used in an entirely different sense in the New? Would Jesus have used the term in so very different a sense from that in which the Jews had been accustomed to understand it, (and it was never used in addressing Gentiles,) without giving the least intimation that he had entirely changed its meaning from that in which their ancient prophets used it.

7—Though Schleusner, Dr. George Campbell, and other advocates of the doctrine of endless misery, assume that GEHENNA was afterwards used to designate the future punishment of the wicked, or the state of the damned in the eternal world, it is only their OPINION, unaccompanied by a particle of proof. They may assume or opine ever so confidently, and you may assert ever so positively any doctrine or position you please, but this to me and our readers is no proof. You and they can prove as far as the Bible warrants, the application of GEHENNA to severe temporal punishments; but beyond this you have no warrant in the Bible to go. As the term was used in the Old Testament to designate, besides the literal valley of Hinnom, the severe temporal judgments coming on the Jews, I maintain that it was used by the Saviour in the New Testament in the same or a similar sense, to designate the severe temporal judgments coming on the same nation. Therefore I do not say, that because GEHENNA originally meant the VALLEY OF HINNOM, it cannot represent a state of punishment after death in another world; but I say YOU HAVE BROUGHT NO PROOF OF THE LATTER. Give us the *proof*, sir, and we believe; but not without. Or show that my definition is incorrect, and I give it up. [See my June letter, published in your August number, 19th and 20th paragraphs.]

Digitized by Google

8—The position you would establish by showing the fallacy of your peripatetic syllogisms, reminds me of, and is about as well sustained, as the visionary theory of Emanuel Swedenborg. Swedenborg established his doctrine by CORRESPONDENCIES, you yours by CONTRASTS; and though both are alike visionary and devoid of proof, the Baron's is altogether the most beautiful and inviting. You attempt to establish the doctrine of ENDLESS MISERY on the ground that it is the exact opposite of the ENDLESS HAPPINESS!—of ETERNAL DEATH, not once mentioned in the Bible, on the ground that ETERNAL LIFE IS mentioned! About as consistent as the orthodox argument, that because there is a personal *God*, there must be a personal *devil*. Of two days, one is said to be *hot* and the other *cold*. It is proved that the thermometer rose to 100 degrees of Fahrenheit on the *hot* day. It follows *syllogistically*, and by *contrast*, that it must have sunk just 100 degrees below zero, on the *cold* day!

9—I deny that the Hebrew SHEMIM, and Greek GEHENNA, are always used in opposite or contrasted senses in scripture, or that the Saxon HEAVEN and HELL are always, or generally, or even frequently, so used. True, they are so used Matt. xi. 23. & Luke x. 15; but you will not contend that in these places any thing more is meant, than temporal prosperity and temporal adversity. There are a great variety of senses in which these Saxon words are used in the Bible, but these different senses are by no means always opposites. HEAVEN (or heavens) is used to signify the air, the visible sky, the heavenly bodies, temporal prosperity, honor, exaltation, God himself, or his dominion and providence, spiritual enjoyment, and sometimes the place or state of endless happiness hereafter. HELL is used to signify the grave, the state of all the dead, a dark, hidden or concealed state, temporal adversity or destruction, mental condemnation, guilt, remorse of conscience, the valley of Hinnom, the judgments of God on the Jewish nation and infidel persecuting opposers of his gospel; but that it signifies a place of misery in the eternal world, *you have not offered one particle of proof*, nor do I believe you *can* offer any. This strong rampart of error then falls for want of support; and I therefore 'do claim for the truth a decided victory' here. And the greater 'conspicuity' you have sought to give this point of the debate, only serves to render your defeat the more signal.

10—Your 11th paragraph is mostly about a matter on which we do not differ essentially, and which is not in dispute between us, viz. the meaning of the words rendered HEAVEN, &c. It is needless, therefore, to waste words about my 'shuffling' or 'changing the point,' which I certainly did not do. I have shown above, that you were not to the point, or rather that *that* point was not to the question in dispute. The conclusion of your 11th paragraph, is a NON SEQUITUR.

11—One can hardly avoid smiling on the perusal of your 12th paragraph. After accusing me of a 'highly turgid and boastful manner,' and of 'sinning against human dignity,' by 'misinterpreting the language of decency and respect,' we have a formal declaration of your extreme 'modesty.' Reader, take notice, my friend Campbell is a very 'modest' man in controversy. But unfortunately for him, his ARGUMENTS, instead of being 'a little stronger than his ASSERTIONS,' fall very far short of them. Indeed the latter, though the very quintessence of modesty, are frequently found entirely unsupported and widely sepa-

Digitized by Google

rated from the former. In the same paragraph you *assert* that you have fully proved, '1st. that GEHENNA in the New Testament does NOT represent the valley of Hinnom;' and '2d. that it does' '*positively*' 'represent a state of future punishment after death.' Very modest! In your 13th paragraph, you seem to think I misinterpret the authors I quote or refer to, relative to Matt. v. 22. viz. Parkhurst, Macknight, Rosenmuller, Heylin, Wynne, Wakefield, and A. Clarke. You appear dissatisfied with the authority I refer to. Well, my dear sir, I will endeavor to suit you better now, so far as *authority* is concerned. I now quote from a note on Matt. v. 22. found in the new version or translation of the New Testament, by *Alexander Campbell*. 'The fact is, that the allusions in this verse are all to human institutions or customs among the Jews; and the Judges, the Sanhedrim, and the hell-fire here introduced, are ALL HUMAN PUNISHMENTS.'—'The following translation of this verse is expressive of the sense of the original: 'Whoever is vainly incensed against his brother, shall be obnoxious to the sentence of the judges; (the court of twenty-three;) whoever shall say to his brother, (in the way of contempt,) *Shallow brains*, shall be obnoxious to the Sanhedrim; and whoever shall say, Apostate wretch, (the highest expression of malice,) shall be obnoxious to the GEHENNA OF FIRE,' or to being burned alive in the valley of Hinnom. This translation is in substance approved by Adam Clarke, and other critics of respectability.'

12—Thus our readers may see how very differently my learned opponent talks and writes when honestly endeavoring in his private study, to give the true sense of scripture in a new version, and when engaged in a controversy with a Universalist. I trust, my dear sir, that you will not complain of this authority, and also trust that we shall see no more repetitions of your 'modest' *assertions* that you 'have fully proved that *gehenna* in the New Testament, does not represent the valley of Hinnom,' &c.

13—Your 14th paragraph charges me with admitting that the phrase 'enter into life,' is, in scripture style, equivalent to entering into eternal happiness or immortal beatitude, throwing the smoke of ambiguity around the phrase, and then immediately flying from the issue formed with you on the subject. By re-examining my arguments, our readers will perceive that I have done neither. I have not admitted, and do not admit, that 'enter into life' is *ever* equivalent in scripture, to entering into immortal beatitude in the eternal world. So far from seeking to obscure the meaning of the phrase, I studiously avoided all ambiguity, a thing, by the bye, of which I fear you will never be guilty, so long as a *double entendre* will serve your purpose better. You well knew that 'heaven,' 'kingdom of heaven,' 'eternal life,' &c. were phrases which were vulgarly used and understood in a different sense from their usual scriptural import, and that they would answer for you to play an ambiguous game with.

14—In reply to your 14th, 15th, and 16th paragraphs, I remark that the phrase 'enter into life' only occurs in three passages in the New Testament, viz. Matt. xviii. 8, 9. and xix. 17. and Mark ix. 43—47. and in all the three passages evidently means entering into the gospel dispensation, or Christian institution, and nothing more or less, my learned opponent's *modest assertion* to the contrary notwithstanding. The only way of coming at the true meaning of the phrase, is to collate

Digitized by Google

all the places where it occurs, with their respective contexts, and compare them with other phrases as nearly resembling it as can be found. The passages I cited 'hath everlasting life'—'is passed from death unto life.' John v. 24; John iii. 14. 'enter into rest,' Heb. iv. 3. and others of the same stamp—I do and will maintain are precisely synonymous with the phrase '*enter into life*,' Mark ix. 43, 45, 47, and its parallels. This fact is confirmed by the Saviour, Matt. xix. 23, 24. where he gives as the true meaning of *entering into life*, verse 17, this comment, 'A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven'—'for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,' evidently meaning, that the rich could never enter the abodes of immortal blessedness, but that they would be the last, or least likely of all, to expose themselves to reproach and enter the church of Christ in that generation. This view is further confirmed by a valuable note of your own in the appendix to your version of the New Testament. You say on Matt. xi. 12. 'The Scribes and Pharisees claimed for themselves the chief places in this kingdom [of heaven] and were, by their conduct, shutting this kingdom against men. Publicans and harlots, however, in opposition to the influence and example of those men, received the doctrine of the Messiah, and thus, as it were, invaded or took possession of that kingdom, from which the elders and doctors [the rich men] excluded them. Finally, the Gentiles too, by their faith in the Messiah, and their consequent boldness, took possession of this heavenly kingdom.' Thus, sir, by your own arguments, your own authority, and on your own premises, I have met you on the issue, and a glorious defeat is yours.

15—In your 17th paragraph you again repeat your caricature of what you call my Universalist 'dogma.' But, sir, until you see from my pen, or from some Universalist in existence, the idea advanced that *repentance* and *punishment*, or *repentance* and *hell* are synonymous, I beg of you for your own reputation never to be guilty of another such outrage. Does not so great a logician as you profess to be, know the difference between *cause* and *effect?*—between *means* and *end?* We do not regard *repentance*, either as *hell*, or as any *punishment* at all; but it may be the *result* of just and fatherly punishment.

16—On the perusal of your 18th paragraph, I wanted to whisper in your ear, '*Keep cool, friend Campbell—keep cool!* you will not only *feel* but *do* much better if you will.' You again introduce here your groundless charge of having a hell with a *perhaps* in the middle of it. If the reader will again refer to my June letter, published in the Millennial Harbinger for August, he will see there was no other *perhaps* than this: I gave three definitions of *sheol*, and said the word was used Ps. ix. 17. in the 2d or 3d of those senses, or *perhaps* both. And, sir, may not a man endure *remorse of conscience* or *temporal destruction*, separately? and may he not endure them *both together?* Answer *no*, if you dare. I am glad you inform me your 27th paragraph was given to disprove my position on this subject; for otherwise I should not have known it. Try again, my good sir. On the closing part of your 18th paragraph I will simply remark, that *sneers* are not *arguments*.

17—In your 19th paragraph you say, my 'quotations from the Old Testament' [relative to the *unquenchable fire*, the 'fire that shall never go out,' &c.] 'are not in point,' and that 'not one of them is of the *genus* much less of the *species* before us.' I admit, sir, that not one of them is of such a *genus* as to prove *endless misery*, though they are generally of the very *species* of the texts under discussion, containing the same phraseology generally, and in some instances even stronger. '*Their worm shall*

Digitized by Google

not die, neither shall their fire be quenched,' Isa. lxvi. 24. is quite as strong phraseology as *'the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched,'* Mark ix. But the same thing substantially is meant by both. The phraseology concerning the duration of the fire and the judgments of God, mentioned Isa. xxxiv. 10. is quite as strong as the phrase *everlasting fire,* Matt. xviii. 8. and xxv. 41. And the very fact that the article *the* (the Greek *to*) is prefixed to the phrase, confirms my views. It shows that, in the opinion of Jesus, the Jews understood what was meant by *the* everlasting fire, *the* unquenchable fire, *the* gehenna of fire, viz. the same that their ancient prophets had so frequently mentioned. It was a *definite* subject familiar to them all; and hence his use of the definite article. But if it had been an entirely new subject, never before broached, or new language, never before used and wholly unknown among the Jews, is it possible that the great Teacher of truth would have used the definite article, and called it *the* everlasting fire, *the* gehenna of fire, &c., and never explained what he meant by it? No, sir, I cannot think it possible. And if the doctrine of endless misery had never before been taught, (and certainly the Old Testament does not contain it,) how is it possible his disciples could have understood him to refer to so awful an event, when he used, without any explanation whatever, the *very language* which the Jews had always used and understood in a very different sense? Can you answer? I may just as logically and more truly affirm, that *'the everlasting fire* substituted by Jesus for the word *hell,* is never found identified with,' nor remotely hinting at, future punishment; as you do that it is never used in any *but* that sense. I may then add that *you have not and cannot produce a single instance in the whole Bible, wherein it is applied to any thing beyond the present state.* And I will again add, that *if you should, it would be nothing to your purpose;* for we are not discussing the question of *future punishment,* but of *endless punishment.* I wait for some evidence from you on the affirmative of the second proposition, before I attempt further proof of the negative.

18—You confirm my version of the 'fable,' when you admit that you agree with the serpent that Adam did *'not surely die'* the threatened death *'in the day'* of transgression, but lived nine hundred and thirty years after his creation.

19—It will be time to reply to your arguments promised in your 21st paragraph when they appear. I will not waste my 'spittle' to quench your sun till it rises. If I thought there were any thing worthy of further notice in the paragraphs you think I 'pass too slightly over,' I surely would attend to them. If they do really contain arguments of weight unanswered, our readers, I doubt not, will see and give you credit therefor. But I assure you that if you deposited any 'burning coals' therein, they must have gone out, however unquenchable or everlasting they might have been; for I felt of them, and there was no warmth in them whatever.

20—Your 23d paragraph appears to be the offspring of spleen and petulency, or of disappointed ambition in being wholly unable to gainsay the evidence adduced, that the *damnation of gehenna,* Matt. xxiii. meant the severe judgment and destruction that our Saviour foretold the Jews should come upon them. However 'baseless, wretched, miserable, blind, and naked' my arguments or opinion, I happen to have the company of the learned and orthodox Theophylact and Bishop Pearce on my side. If you were present at the calamities that befel the Jews, at and just before the destruction of their city, perhaps you could tell whether Jesus *spake the truth* in foretelling those woes, and how large a portion of that genera-

Digitized by Google

tion had to be raised from the dead! I hope my dear friend will get in better humor before he writes again.

In all kindness and friendship, I am yours,

D. SKINNER.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER.

No. X.

BETHANY, Va., August 22, 1837.

My dear Sir—YOUR letter No. IX. not having yet arrived, and I being on the eve of departing from home, as intimated in my last, in order that the discussion may go forward I proceed to offer a few reflections on the 2d proposition, the first having been as fully discussed as it can well be without the second: for already have you been speculating upon the words *everlasting* and *forever*, as they are sometimes found in the sacred scriptures. See your letter No. VII. p. 389.

2—The second proposition is thus drafted by yourself.—"Do the words *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, &c. when applied to the punishment of the wicked mean duration without end?" You deny—I affirm.

3—I ask, Why should they not? Why should they mean duration without end when applied to the happiness of the righteous, and not duration without end when applied to the punishment of the wicked? It cannot be from the force or meaning of the words themselves: for if they at one time mean duration without end—if they fairly have that force and power in any case, they may have it in another, unless there be something in the nature of the substantive with which they are connected absolutely prohibitory of that signification. If it is admitted (as I think it is by you, sir—nay, your own proposition declares it,) that they do, *when applied to the happiness of the righteous*, mean duration without end; it would be whimsical in the extreme to ask for a special law limiting their meaning when applied to the punishment of wicked men. Why in the name of reason should *aion*, for instance, when applied to happiness mean *endless*, and when applied to punishment mean *ending!* Do, sir, in the plenitude of your benevolence for us who believe in punishment after death, give us your reasons, numerically arranged, why *aionion* bliss should be *endless*, and *aionion* misery *ending!* The secret which you are about to disclose will be, of course, either in the substantive or in the adjective. If in the *adjective*, by what authority or by what secret charm, or rather by what inspiration does it instantly mean endless duration when it is followed by the word *happiness*, and as instantly mean limited duration when prefixed to the word *punishment!* But if the meaning of the adjective is found in the substantive, and if the reason is not in itself, but in its associate, why should we have any dispute about the meaning of the adjective, inasmuch as it is a perfect cypher without value? Thus if you put 1 before a cypher, it means 10; but if you put 1 behind a cypher, it means 1-10th, while by itself it counts nothing. Thus having no meaning in itself, its prefix or suffix gives it sense: so with you, *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, when prefixed to *happiness*, mean *endless millions;* but prefixed or suffixed to *punishment*, only mean parts of millions or ending millionths. Truly your logic, as well as your cause, is of a singular daring, and in

Digitized by Google

its aspirations to the clouds treads upon the hills and mountains of argument as though it moved over the sandy plains of the desert. A mammoth would feel himself as much impeded by a cobweb as a bold Universalist by all the laws of language.

4—Not so bold and courageous as you, sir, I argue that if *olem*, *aion*, *aionios*, independent of the noun-substantive in construction, have any meaning when prefixed to *happiness*, they have the same meaning when prefixed to *punishment*. In one word, when Christ says, 'These shall go away into *aionion* punishment, and the righteous into *aionion* life,' the *aionion* means as long or as short in the one case as in the other. Eternal punishment and eternal life are with me two eternals of equal dimensions. I ask you, then, sir, for what reasons the one should be an *ending* and the other an *endless* eternal! Be kind enough, sir, here also to enumerate your reasons, that I may count and weigh them!

5—I could neither flatter nor provoke you to enumerate those other words which represent future punishment, to which *aionios* or its fraternity have been prefixed. I shall therefore have to do it myself. We have them—

1st. *Aionios kolasis*, everlasting punishment, Matth. xxv. 46.

2d. *Aionion olethron*, everlasting destruction, 2 Thess. i. 9.

3d. *Aionios krisis*, everlasting damnation, or condemnation, Mark iii. 29. This is defined to be the consequence of an *unpardonable* sin—a sin *never* to be forgiven.

4th. *Aionion krima*, everlasting judgment, or punishment, Hebrews vi. 2.

5th. *Aionion pur*, everlasting fire, Matth. xviii. 8: xxv. 41. "*The everlasting fire* prepared for the devil and his angels."

6—Here are no less than *five* words applied to the future state of wicked men, to which *aionios* is an adjective. We have endless punishment, endless destruction, endless damnation, endless judgment, endless fire. These are then to be superadded to your first *three*, *sheol*, *hades*, *gehenna*, and to *tartarus* also. Thus your three have already, in my hands, become *nine*—*sheol*, *hades*, *gehenna*, *tartarus*, *kolasis*, *olethros*, *krisis*, *krima*, *pur*. How logical, then, is your first proposition which selects three out of nine!!

7—We have *aionios*, endless or everlasting, applied to *five* only out of the nine, because two of them are Hebrew, and one of these (sheol) is not indeed in its nature *aionios*. But not one of the words in your second proposition has ever been found in construction with any of the three terms in your first proposition!!! I emphasize on the word *aionios*, because it is of the three the only epithet that could be expected in the Greek Testament; because it has all the pith and marrow of the Hebrew *olem* and the Greek *aion* in it; and because we have this word applied to "life" *forty-five* times in the New Testament. For while we have the phrase "everlasting life" only once in the Old Testament, we have *aionios zoe* ("eternal life") forty-five times in the New!

8—We have indeed *aion* with prepositions used adverbally, as *eis ton aiona*, having with a verb the same power as *aionios* with a substantive. This word, *aion*, in various forms is found *one hundred and three times* in the New Testament; and when relating to time alone, or simple duration, is usually, if not always, rendered *for ever*, or with a negative particle *never*.

Digitized by Google

9—This term has frequently in construction the force of an adjective, as when we say, "The blackness of darkness is reserved for certain wicked persons for ever," it is equivalent to '*Eternal darkness* awaits them.' Both Peter and Jude thus use this phrase; so that the future punishment of wicked men may with propriety be said to be exhibited under the figure of *eternal darkness*, outer darkness, or the blackness of eternal darkness.

10—But I fear I shall soon tread on your toes; for I am here obliged to observe that the only word that expresses simple *duration without end* in the New Testament is *aion*, the roots of which are *aei*, and *oon*, being, *always existing*. The adjective formed from it, more naturally than any other word in Greek, expresses the *always being* or duration of the substantive with which it stands in construction. While other adnouns or epithets speak of other qualities of the things defined, this word regards simple existence, being, or duration alone. Thus immortal, incorruptible, indissoluble, indestructible, imperishable, are associated with the elements of things, their peculiar organization, constitution, or composition; while *aionios*, enduring, *always being*, has respect to their existence itself, or simple duration. Immortal, incorruptible, indissoluble, indestructible, imperishable, denote two or more ideas, and only *figuratively* and secondarily or inferentially express eternal being, while this epithet regards simple duration, and literally expresses endless existence. When speaking of deified dead men, or of corruprible beasts and their images, an Apostle would say, "*The immortal God*," "*the incorruptible God;*" but when he speaks of God with regard to his eternal being, as in Romans xvi. 26., he calls him the *aionion*, "the everlasting God." Nay, indeed, when he conceives of him in reference to mortal and corruptible creatures, and speaks of his absolute eternity, he places this before all other epithets, as in 1 Tim. i. 17. "Now to the King *eternal*, (*aionios*) immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor," &c. This places the true meaning of this most lofty of all adjectives, in its proper relation. For the self-existence, *the always being*, the eternity of God, is, of all conceptions which we can form of him, the most sublime. Incorruptible, indissoluble, immortal, &c. are taken from things of yesterday, as it were; but this admirably corresponds with him whose incommunicable name is I AM. *Oon* is the living or active participle of this said verb I AM: so that *aion* has the whole divinity in it as respects the most lofty and sublime of all his names and attributes.

10—The rancor with which this adjective is assailed by all Universalian partizans is in the ratio of its pre-eminence. I have here, sir, some recollections of your bold assertions concerning this word in your February letter, and shall therefore lay down my pen and see what you have alleged against it.

11—I perceive from the perusal of said letter, that more than two-thirds of it consists of criticisms and dissertations upon the words indicative of duration, or such as you would have the reader to regard in that light. These are tastefully interlarded with a few introductory compliments to myself—such as, "Your constant and overweening, yet fruitless efforts throughout your reply to Mr. M."—"You are unable to adduce a particle of evidence in favor of this assertion"—"There is no possible ground on which you can raise even a plausible argument

Digitized by Google

in favor of the endless perpetuty of punishment"—"Your unfairness and disingenuousness"—"The God-dishonoring and soul-withering system of endless punishment"—"You evidently saw the impossibility of fairly maintaining your position, and therefore to invalidate the force, &c. you state"—"One false position requires several more to sustain it" —"This declaration was evidently made when driven to a most distressing strait," &c. &c. There is one excuse, Mr. Skinner, for this very complimentary and debonair introduction:—You wished to try my nerves, and see how much I could bear while at the threshold of the discussion. Perhaps, too, your indignation was at fever-heat because of my exposition to Mr. Montgomery of the nakedness of your benevolent system in its attempts to expel from the universe "*that horrid doctrine*," as you call it, that God will punish sin.

12—You will think that I am about to retaliate when I tell you that your dissertations on Greek terms are more like an irony or a satire on criticism, than a sober, grave, and literary inquiry into the meaning of words: but, I assure you, sir, that there is no vengeance in this declaration, but a desire to induce you to reconsider your reasonings, or rather your hazardous and unauthorized assertions about the meaning of words.

13—In my letter to Mr. Montgomery, after quoting his language on the words *incorruptible*, *endless life*, *incorruption*, and *immortality*, with his question, "Are these words applied to the punishment of the wicked?" I answer, "*No*, nor to the happiness of the righteous, nor to *simple duration* at all. Two of them are substantives, and therefore cannot be used as epithets, viz. 'immortality' and 'incorruption;' and the other three apply to *beings* or material substances in reference to simple indissolubility; not one of them could properly be applied to a simple state of being, or to happiness or misery: for although the word 'endless' might seem to be an exception, when the original word is considered it is not. It only *figuratively* signifies *endless*, as any one may see who will examine either the etymological import or the common use of *akatalutos* in Greek writers." This answer became the theme of your first letter, so far as my letter to Mr. M. was concerned. Your whole effort is an attempt to prove that these words are applied to the happiness of the righteous and to simple duration. And, strange as it may appear, you have not adduced a single passage from the Bible where the words immortal happiness, incorruptible happiness, endless life happiness, immortality happiness, ever do occur; nor a single passage where immortal duration, incorruptible duration, endless life duration, immortality duration, occur. But you attempt to show that these words and their fraternities have respect to "the resurrection state and the ENDLESS PERPETUITY thereof;" evidently, therefore, they must have some applicability to happiness and simple duration!!! This is your head and front and conclusion philological in proof that these words do belong to happiness and simple duration.

14—Every word, then, that has respect to a state, will logically and grammatically properly apply to the persons in that state. If I say of the married state, 'It is a delightful, blessed state,' it is equivalent to saying that Mrs. Femina is a delightful, blessed wife, and that Mr. Homo is a delightful and blessed husband! All this may be; but it follows not, by any rule or law of nature or of logic, that what may be true of a state, or person, or thing in the concrete, or in a particular

Digitized by Google

circumstance, is an attribute of any one of them. For this plain reason, sir, there is not an atom of logic or philology in the *five-sevenths* of your February epistle. You are all the while laboring under the delusion THAT WHAT MAY BE TRUE OF THREE, FIVE, OR SEVEN THINGS IN THE CONCRETE, IS TRUE OF EACH OF THEM IN THE ABSTRACT. Thus Paul speaks of an immortal, indissoluble, imperishable, incorruptible body, because that body may be happy; therefore he writes of immortal, indissoluble, imperishable, incorruptible duration and happiness!!

15—But after describing the resurrection state, you ask, "Can any enlightened person," &c. &c. "read Paul's description of a state of glory, honor, power, incorruption, immortality, imperishableness, indissolubility, indestructibility, &c. and then honestly say he believes these terms have no APPLICABILITY *whatever* to the happiness of the righteous or to duration?"

16—"No applicability whatever." What a subtle changing of the question, or what an imposition on one's self and the community! "No applicability whatever"! That is not the question in debate. Why, sir, I would not say that fearlessness, contentedness, peacefulness, delightfulness, joyfulness, sociableness, communicativeness, have no applicability whatever to the happiness of the righteous. But why do you talk of the happiness of the righteous in the resurrection state, seeing you say there will then be no wicked in the universe!

17—To have no sort of applicability, direct or indirect, proximate or remote, concomitant, precedent or subsequent, is one category; and whether any of these words can be epithets of happiness or of duration—applicable to happiness or duration, is quite another category. For example, we say that LONG, SHORT, PERPETUAL, &c. apply to duration; for they make sense with that word: but who ever heard of incorruption duration, or indestructibility duration? Besides, sir, there is in the word IMMORTALITY, and in all the others, an idea of duration; and to apply them to duration would be to define a thing by itself!—as, for instance, a *rosey* rose, a *lily*-looking lily, an *opposing* opponent. So ends this chapter of your *logical* logic!

18—Your comparison and affirmation that "felicity is applicable to express happiness" is out of the reach of criticism. Matters of criticism must always have something plausible about them. To show that felicity is applicable to itself, and that one can make it an epithet of bliss, is a shift which peculiarly belongs to Universalism. But, perhaps, you did not perceive the sophism in proving from the words, "I am in a state of complete felicity," that you change the subject of comparison from the *state* to the person; and thence infer what belongs to the one belongs to the other!!

19—You proceed to the Greek language, and give us definitions of AKATALUTOS by Donnegan and Grove in proof—of what?—That it expresses an attribute of duration or of happiness! They define by the word eternal, everlasting, endless! Nay, indeed; but by the words "not loosened or destroyed, indissoluble, indestructible, firm, stable, binding" And with their definitions you argue that is one of the terms that more than AIONIOS, or any other, signifies eternal. Strange that your own authorities should not have given as its first, middle, or last meaning, eternal, everlasting, or endless!! To help you, too, this word occurs but once in the New Testament. What a splendid subject of

Digitized by Google

debate against AIONIOS, which occurs in the New Testament SEVENTY-FIVE TIMES, translated by the words ETERNAL, EVERLASTING, and FOREVER; and by no other!!

20—You next define APTHARSIA, which is found *eight* times in the New Testament; and most learnedly quote Donnegan, Grove, and Loveland as lexicographers, defining it, "imperishableness, immortality, incorruptibility, and incorruption;" and yet not once by the words eternal, everlasting, forever, endless!!!

21—Then you submit APHTHARTOS, which occurs SEVEN times. Donnegan explains it, INCORRUPTIBLE, IMMORTAL, ETERNAL. Here we have got the word ETERNAL for the first and last time in your select terms, and here it is the THIRD and most figurative meaning according to your authority.

22—"Last of all, the woman died also"! You give us ATHANASIA, which occurs THREE times, and which your Loveland defines "exemption from death or dissolution, immortality." Which of these four terms you will put into your third proposition, when you undertake to furnish "a word that expresses duration without end, not applied to the future punishment of the wicked, or that assures us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end," I wist not; but I advise you to choose AKATALUTOS, because it occurs but once, and will afford most ground for debate!

23—These four words are found in all the New Testament nineteen times, and your authorities give us ETERNAL once as the third meaning of APHTHARTOS; but, unfortunately for this single ETERNAL, APHTHARTOS, Paul places it after AIONIOS, and shows that in his critical skill it differs from it most subordinately:—"Now unto the King eternal, AIONIOS, immortal, APHTHARTOS, the only wise God," &c. 1 Tim. i. 17. Thus, sir, the Apostle gives the negative to your ONCE eternal against the SEVENTY-FIVE TIMES we find eternal, everlasting, or forever, which, in the judgment of ALL TRANSLATORS and LEXICOGRAPHERS, is the true and proper meaning of AIONIOS. I say ALL translators and dictionary-makers, for there is not one on earth that I have ever seen or heard of, that does not give ETERNAL or EVERLASTING as the first and most natural literal and obvious meaning of AIONIOS. I have now lying around me all the great authorities, Stokius, Schreevelius, Thesauros Græcae Linguæ, Robertson, Parkhurst, Greenfield, &c. &c. and all these superadded to your list. give UNLIMITED DURATION, ETERNAL, EVERLASTING as the proper meaning of AIONIOS.

24—Eternal, endless, everlasting, &c. be it observed, like all other words, are used figuratively. I often speak of my everlasting solace, my endless labors, my ceaseless cares, &c. But who thence infers that these words have no higher signification with me, no proper and unfigurative meaning, errs, as that person errs who would say because "everlasting" is applied to an order of priesthood, to hills and mountains, &c. therefore, when applied to things beyond time or after death, it means a limited time, or a short duration?

25—These are not the words that belong to time, only in a figurative sense. In their literal sense they are only applicable to God and that world which is itself eternal. Hence God, in both Testaments, is called the everlasting and the eternal God. The future state of the righteous is by Jesus called "eternal life," and the future state of the

Digitized by Google

wicked "everlasting punishment." But as yet we have only introduced this matter and offered a few reasons why we allege that AION and AIONIOS, as well as their Hebrew and English representatives, should, when they are used in reference to objects connected with another world, whatever these objects may be, be uniformly understood in the sense of that world to which they belong. If to the present world, they are used figuratively or in a part of their signification; but when used as in relation to the eternal or future world, they ought to be understood as the world to which they belong is understood.

All which is respectfully submitted by your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

News from the Churches.

HOWARD, Centre county, *Pa.*, August 7, 1837.

Dear brother Campbell,

WE know it is a matter of great joy to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, to learn the state of affairs in the different portions of country where the gospel of the New Testament has been introduced, unmixed with the doctrines and commandments of men. Since the Spring of 1832, more than three hundred persons have been immersed for remission within the bounds of a very small portion of this county. Some have apostatized through the influence of the tyrant *Habit*. Long accustomed to gratify their passions, the moral disease has arrived at a crisis that bids defiance even to the potent efficacy of the medicine of the Great Physician. Some moral as well as physical diseases, I am persuaded, are beyond the control and power of medicine: the disease may be checked for a time, but chronic cases are often fatal even after we suppose a cure has been effected. "Ephraim is joined to his idols: let him alone." How important that young people obey the gospel, and become confirmed in habits of doing good! Some who have been discipled in this neighborhood have migrated to the West; some have run well for a season, and, bless God, have left these mortal shores in hope of an eternity of immortality in a future world. The others, constituting two churches (congregations) are continuing in the Apostles' doctrine, &c.

Very recently seven persons have been raised with Christ by baptism, in this vicinity.

N. J. MITCHELL.

FORKED CREEK, Wills county, *Ill.*, August 7, 1837.

I find social privileges in regard to the Apostles' doctrine very limited here. I found brother J. P. Gager, from Cayuga county, N. Y., in this vicinity—a good, warm-hearted disciple. I last Fall incidentally fell in with brother Cory, who, from appearance, is a worthy brother: he resides some thirty miles from me. I had occasion a few weeks since to immerse

Digitized by Google

two persons into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, which produced no little excitement. The prejudices of the people are against us; and in a rare population as this country is possessed of, together with the other disadvantages attendant on such a state of society as we have here—viz. that small groups and parties have emigrated from other countries, and brought with them their Creeds and Confessions, and others are laboring under the want of the light of science, so that it is very difficult to find access to the intellect. If it were so ordered by Divine Providence that among the emigrants here we should have an accession of a few substantial brethren, I think our prospects would brighten. We are in a good country; and hope to see some of our more intelligent brethren locate amongst us, that we reap the advantages of their society. ELIAS FREER.

TUSCALOOSA, *Ala.*, August 1, 1837.

A general excitement in this city, vicinity, and throughout the state, where the mind is religiously healthy, is going on. Some of the most zealous and talented are filing *bills* of indictment against the sectarian vernacular. Alas for confusion of tongues! But there are yet they who speak the language of Ashdod, and swear in their wrath that it shall be the lingo of Zion.

On the 4th Lord's day in July, a Baptist rural *vocal* musician, with his boisterous minstrels, actuated by previous determination to sing down reformation, (which is a new *modus operandi* in opposition to the good cause,) met me at my appointment, or made his on the same day, and for the sole purpose of discomfitting my efforts. I awaited on the *gentleman* until 12 o'clock, and then took the pulpit, with a proposition to the musician, that, to prevent *discord*, I would delay until 1 o'clock, provided he would then desist. But "*No!*" was the stern reply. I was bound by my engagement to preach. I introduced the subject amid the broken intonations of discord. The singing choir left, in a few minutes, the *tranquil* auditory; and I preached the Christian's gospel.

I am threatened with brute lectures or *mob* incivilities. Am I worthy thus to suffer for Messiah's cause? I am determined, God helping, to act prudently, demean myself as a Christian, give no offence to Jew nor Gentile, nor church of God; and with this life, amid all vituperation, slander, and contempt, to preach the ancient gospel. I know in whom I have trusted. The Lord reigns: let all the inhabitants of the earth rejoice.———In hope, J. A. BUTLER.

N. B.—This singing spirit is an exotic, and not a native plant. In justice to a majority of our opponents (I mean the informed part) there are not those on earth possessed of more manly, Christian, and dignified character, than those of Tuscaloosa and its vicinity—many of whom, I have no doubt, will yet preach the cause of reformation.

J. A. B.

Digitized by Google

VICTORY, *N. Y.*, August 1, 1837.

Brethren J. J. Moss and Abraham Sanders have made us a visit in this state, and labored in the word and teaching considerably. Their labors, in connexion with those of other brethren, have brought about seventy to the acknowledgment of the truth in a little more than two months.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

RICHMOND, *Ky.*, August 22, 1837.

We have been laboring here for eleven days, and one hundred and one have yielded obedience to the gospel formerly delivered to the saints. Almost all of them were of the world, and never had been immersed. The prospects are better now than when we commenced. We average about 8 each day. The laborers now with us, are, Dr. Adams, Jacob Creath, Jr., John Morton, and the resident brethren. We are expecting more of them.

J. T. JOHNSON.

HANCOCK, *Ohio*, August 17, 1837.

We have lately had a two days' meeting at my house, the 29th and 30th of last month. Brother Wetty, 12 miles east of me, being sick, brother Wilson had to do the preaching, except what little I tried to do myself. There were four immersed for the remission of sins, one on Saturday and three on Lord's day following. About four weeks previous I immersed two; brother Wilson immersed four about the same time—in all, ten have lately, within a short distance of this, we hope, died to sin and been raised to a newness of life through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.—May we all walk in the unity of the Spirit and in the bonds of love, is the prayer, we are assured, of all the faithful in Christ Jesus.

Our number at present in this vicinity is about forty, including the disciples west of us, at Sugar creek, who have lately organized in gospel order, formerly a part of this congregation, (at Riley creek.)

We expect others soon to make the good confession, as we are assured that nothing but courage is wanting to enable them to yield obedience to the King of kings and Lord of lords.

HENRY L. DALLY.

CHARLESTOWN, *Ind.*, August 24, 1837.

Brother Brown and myself have been recently preaching in a neighborhood about 4 miles from this place. The 5th Lord's day in July I attended with brother Littell between this place and New Albany. Six made the good confession. Four in this place have been immersed.—Brother Newton Short informed me the other day, that on the 13th of this month he finished a tour of ten days through part of Jennings and Jackson counties; that he had immersed 16, and received 4 who had been immersed by the Baptists. In a neighborhood in Floyd county, brother Beggerley has recently immersed upwards of 20; so I am informed.—Brother B. Allen informed me a few days ago, on his return from a tour

Digitized by Google

through this state, that in Columbus ten made the good confession and were immersed, and several more in other places did likewise. The good cause is going on gloriously in this state. May it every where succeed!

M. COLE.

GOSPORT, *Ind.*, August 25, 1837.

By these few lines you may know something of our success in pleading the cause of the Bible in these regions. Prospects for the *truth* in Indiana are much more favorable than at any former period. I have been riding and preaching constantly since the first of April last, and have had the pleasure of immersing about 50 persons into the death of Christ since that time. And I rejoice to say, that I have seen many whose minds have long been fettered by the gloomy systems of men, come out on the *truth*, determined to be free—placing themselves under law to Christ. "Truth will prevail" At Mill Grove, in this county, (Owen,) the brethren and sisters, (19 in number,) on the 1st day of July associated themselves together as a congregation of the Lord, to keep the ordinances as they were delivered to us by the holy Apostles of the Lamb: they now number near 50; a part of their increase has been from the Regular Baptists. I have preached to them every two weeks, and other brethren occasionally. On the 4th Lord's day in June I had an appointment in Bloomington, Monroe county. We commenced on Saturday before. Here I was met by bro. W. Walters, late of Danville, Ill. We continued the meeting until Tuesday morning: the fruits of the meeting were 10 added to the church, 8 by immersion and 2 by letter. On the 2d Lord's day in this month I cooperated at Columbus, Ind, with brother B. Allen of Kentucky, and brother J. D. Jones of Indiana. We continued from Saturday till Tuesday night; the fruits of the meeting were 18 added to the church, 12 by immersion. The audience throughout was large, attentive, and solemn; and there was manifestly a good impression made on the whole audience. Upon the whole, I would say, nothing is wanting to a complete *victory* on the side of truth, but more conformity to the will of God and less to the world, among those who have taken the Bible alone for the man of their counsel. O! when will Christians learn to live up to the Rule which they acknowledge!

JAMES M. MATHES.

CUCKOOVILLE, *Va.*, August 29, 1837.

Brethren James Goss and Matthew Webber held a three days' meeting at Mount Gilboa, beginning on the 18th instant, during which 10 made the good confession, and I think many more will shortly honor the King. Those who rejoiced our hearts by publicly acknowledging the Lord, and *thus proving themselves consistent believers*, are amongst the most respectable and intelligent of our country, two of them being very intelligent young Physicians, and deservedly possessing a full share of the public confidence. May they and all exert a salutary influence in the advance-

Digitized by Google

ment of the truth as it is in Jesus, and in the downfall of error and superstition! for great is the prevalence of error and delusion—great is the departure from the word of God, as all may see who will take the Bible alone for their standard, and prove all things by it.

M. PENDLETON.

MIDDLEBURG, *Ohio*, August 30, 1837.

I immersed 22 yesterday and 8 the day before, in this place—the heart and life of the society here. A. CRIHFIELD.

MISCONCEPTIONS.

Brother Campbell—I HAVE read with much pleasure your reply to Mr. Beebee, on *schism;* also, "Mr. Lynd on the Influence of the Holy Spirit." Those two gentlemen, I doubt not, have written the convictions of their minds upon those topics. I am pleased with the calm and Christian spirit which breathes in your reply. These gentlemen have done much towards opening my eyes as to the cause of opposition to the reformation of which we are the avowed advocates. I once thought that men of superior education, talents, and long experience to that which I possessed, were led to oppose our efforts from self-interest or some other unchristian motive. Hence in writing or speaking of them, I too often used language calculated to wound their feelings. I did so from a full persuasion of mind that they knew when they opposed us they were opposing Jesus Christ and his Apostles, as we contended for nothing he and they did not teach; that our opposition to the present order of things among the sects, was to *their traditions* and making *their opinions* terms of union and communion among the believing, penitent, and immersed disciples of Jesus Christ. This conduct of theirs always appeared to me to be derogatory to the government of Jesus Christ. It was assuming to themselves an authority against which the inspired Apostles invariably warned the obedient subjects of the kingdom of heaven. I considered it the spirit of the "man of sin," if not of the "mother of abominations." But upon reading Mr. Lynd's piece in the July number, I am now of the opinion that the wisest and most honest and devout among the sects often read our writing with the veil of sectarianism upon their eyes, if not on their hearts. Thus they may conscientiously oppose us as zealously as Paul did Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and be ignorant of what they are doing and the consequences that must follow such conduct. It becomes us, therefore, seeing they do not understand themselves nor us, to use all tenderness towards men that write with such candor and honesty as Mr. Lynd manifests in his remarks upon your dialogue in "Christianity Restored." This gentleman's course does honor to his head and heart. He 'examines with care' before he undertakes to approve or disapprove, and then speaks out his convictions to all men. This is right and commendable in every man. Would to God that every one who opposes or dissents from the principles advocated by us, would act as Mr. Lynd has done! But, alas! too many condemn without an examination, and in such a way that the injustice done us can never be removed from the minds of thousands.

Digitized by Google

This is a serious matter. "ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS IS SIN," says John the beloved Apostle. We have often heard it asked, Wherein do we reform? I answer, From "all unrighteousness." If a periodical advocating this reformation were to act as the sectarian papers and their advocates do, I would sooner throw my money into the Metapony river than pay one cent to support such 'unrighteousness.' And it is as clear as the sun-beam that editors and teachers do misrepresent us, because we do not admit their traditions and opinions are essential to the salvation of men. They have privately as well as publicly labored to make the impression that we have "fearfully erred, and departed from the faith delivered to the saints," in "some points of vital importance in the gospel system," and then refused us the liberty of proving to their readers or hearers that it was they who had fearfully erred and departed from the faith as delivered to us by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and taken up the theory of some *fallible mortal*, and called a departure from *that theory*, a departure from "points of vital importance." I doubt not that Mr. Lynd's candor and honesty will lead him to discover, from the manner in which you have replied to him, that it is one thing for him to be able to point out this 'fearful error' and 'departure from the faith delivered to the saints,' and quite another for him to make such an allegation.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

From the Sciota Tribune, August 26.

AN IMPOSTOR.

A FEW weeks ago a young man of light complexion, light hair, somewhat inclined to curl, five feet and eight inches high, and calling himself *Henry C. Gilbert*, made his appearance in Lewis county, under the mask of a preacher of the Ancient Gospel. To some of the less informed brethren he produced a letter, which could not be read in consequence of the badness of the writing; but when more inquisitive and better informed brethren desired to see it, he at first pretended he had lost it, then positively declined showing it, and finally left them just before the time appointed by himself for a two days' meeting; and has been heard of since making his way up the Ohio canal. From conversations had with him in my house, he has violated no less than four promises of marriage within the last five months. He professes to have been licensed and sent forth by a church of Christ in Marietta, Ohio; to have travelled in Western Virginia, through Adams and Brown counties, Ohio, and Mason and other counties adjacent in Kentucky, and to have labored with Walter Scott and John P. Johnston, and others in that region.

I am authorized by the brethren in Lewis county, Ky., to say that his behaviour there was not such as became a gospel minister, and that he hated reproof.

JOHN C. ASHLEY.

THE following lines were written on cover of a Bible, found in one of the rooms of the steamer New Castle, by one of the passengers. They at least show that there is a companion that may be found in scenes of disappointment and loneliness, to yield consolation and happiness to a mind that sympathizes in the religion of Jesus Christ:

Methodist Protestant.

Sacred treasure! glad I find thee
Where I end this day of storm,
Weary'd, chill'd, a passing stranger,
Hither on my way I've come.

Sad and lone I sought this chamber,
Disappointed on my way,
Have I cause to feel a stranger
When my eye falls full on thee?

Thou can't warm the heart that loves thee,
Though 'tis chill'd with wind and storm,
Thou can't calm the heart that trusts thee,
Though it heaves with care forlorn.

Welcome, then, thou best companion!
Hearts forlorn and lone to cheer!
Thine are charms of consolation
That shall quell each swelling tear!

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER XI.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *November*, 1837.

OPINIONISM—*No. II.*

KNOWLEDGE, faith, and opinion being contradistinguished and defined, it requires but little reflection to see that opinions never can have any authority other than that of the persons who utter them. The stream cannot rise above its fountain.

The standing of an individual for intellectual and moral attainments is always the measure of the authority or weight of his conjectures and inferences. Therefore, the zeal and warmth of the dogmatist are easily explained, especially as the Apostle Paul has said that "*he is proud.*" To test his standing he has only to propagate an opinion; its success is generally the criterion of his reputation with the people. If it be slighted he feels himself abased and he is affronted. Zeal for an opinion, then, when brought to the touchstone of truth and of the Bible, is mere self-love operating in the form of pride.

Next to spiritual pride intellectual pride is the most haughty. Pride of understanding is immeasureably above all earth-born pride. Mind is justly and generally esteemed the best portion and bequest which God has to communicate. It is better than a gold mine, a crown, a kingdom. Who would not rather have been Shakespear than Crœsus—Milton than Charles II.—Newton than the greatest of the Cesars?

Accident makes the king ninety-nine times in a hundred; but genius makes a Pope or a Byron—mind, and not fortune, makes a Bacon, a Newton, a Cicero.

Mind, then, in human optics, is the pearl of great price—a diamond of inestimable value—more precious than the topaz, the ruby, or the sapphire. Now, as opinions are mere mental operations, and to be regarded as indications of mind, they are much more highly apprecia-

Digitized by Google

ted by their owners than faith or knowledge. A child may have more faith than a philosopher, and a woman of moderate capacity more Christian knowledge than Origen or St. Athanasius; but it requires much genius and some mentalism to make an Arius, a Gregory, an Aristotle, or a Pelagius. Hence such is the glory of an opinionist in his own eyes, that he would sometimes rather give up both his faith and his knowledge than his opinion. These things being so, the mystery that hangs upon the incessant and laborious zeal of the opinionist is dissolved, having both its root and branches in that rankest species of pride which goeth not out at the bidding of any Apostle, but which requires both prayer and fasting and the hand of the Lord to dispossess it.

When two theorists appear in market with their respective opinions, soliciting purchasers for their manufactures, and it happens that they are competitors before the same population, we always expect to see full as much strife, jealousy, evil surmisings, vehemence, detraction, and circumvention as in the conflicts for property or political power, —nay, more, should they be religious theorists. Religious wars about religious opinions are frequently more protracted, severe, and cruel than wars for territory or mere political right: for, unfortunately, the religious opinionist flatters himself that his opinions are more honorable and acceptable to the Deity than the contrary opinions; and thus having baptized his opinions in the font of his veneration, he becomes more intolerant, denunciatory, and exclusive than any other theorist in the world. I had rather differ with a theorist in astronomy, philosophy, language, politics, or in any thing than in religion, especially if he have much veneration; for then his pride of opinion and his zeal for God are combined, and in some temperaments this coalition runs immediately into fanaticism, of all *isms* the most outrageous both against reason and right.

Perhaps, in the increasing light of this age, it may yet be made evident that this peculiar pride of opinion or of understanding, enters more or less into the essence of all partyism amongst men; nay, that it is itself the very spirit of discord, the soul of the sectary, and the demon of all religious persecution. Its name is *Legion*, the first born of Satan, and its brood are emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, treason, heresy. All the contentions and divisions, all the sects and parties in Christendom are as certainly and indisputably the effects of *opinionism*, as the love of money is the root of all evil. It is the oil that supplies the lamp of orthodoxy, and the flame that consumes the tares of heterodoxy. The ardent opinionist, whether Sceptic, Jew, Samaritan, Pagan, or Christian, compasses sea and land and circumnavigates the whole earth to make proselytes; and glories in his converts as so many

Digitized by Google

proofs of his mental superiority—as so many trophies of his rightful sovereignty; and even tithes their devotion, regarding the incense of their gratitude as proportionally divided between the Creator and himself. To some of this class it is presumed the Great Teacher alludes when he says, "Many shall come to me in that day, saying, Lord! Lord! have we not preached in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and performed many wonderful works: to whom I will say, I never acknowledged you; depart from me, you workers of iniquity."

But we have said that, amongst men of discernment, speculations, conjectures, and inferences, *alias* opinions, never can have any religious authority. They may, indeed, assume the form of human precepts and traditions; and, as such, they may vacate or set aside the commandments of God; for all this they have often done, and to this they always tend; yet they can have no rightful jurisdiction in the court of the conscience as respects either religious or moral obligation; consequently they are at best wholly useless in the church of Christ. And how merciful it is on the part of Heaven's government, that, inasmuch as the wisest and best of men have erred in their reasonings on all subjects, we are not to be governed in our ecclesiastic and eternal relations by the decrees of councils, nor by Popes ordinary nor extraordinary, the great or the little dogmatists of ancient or modern days.

But there is one very material injury which the dogmatist or the advocate of his own or others' opinion, inflicts upon society, even when he fails to make a party:—he alienates men's ears from the voice of God, and turns them to himself. This is an exceeding great evil, and we shall be at some pains to explain it.

It is confessed by the most superficial as well as the most profound students of the Bible, that piety, humanity, and happiness are three great topics on which it treats, and that these three are made so plain, and presented in so many striking attitudes to the human understanding, that no sincere or honest seeker after the way of life can possibly err. Mysteries there are in creation, providence, and redemption; and some of these are unfolded and some of them are only alluded to and never explained in the Bible; but all mystery on the subject of piety, morality, and happiness is fully laid open to every honest heart.

Now the being, perfections, and glory of God, as the supreme object of admiration, adoration, and religious homage—as the Creator and Governor of the Universal Frame of Nature—as the Father of our spirits and the Maker of our bodies, are clearly discovered in the volumes of Nature, Law, and Gospel. And as for the reason, necessity, right, and bliss of supremely loving, venerating, worshipping Him in prayers, hymns, thanksgivings, and humble obedience to all his institutions there can be nothing plainer, spoken or written.

Digitized by Google

Again, that sympathy and brotherly kindness amongst Christians, affection, as well as justice, truth, and fidelity in all our engagements to all men—mercy and compassion to all the sons of sorrow and wretchedness—and meekness, temperance, and sobriety in the government of ourselves, are necessary to human bliss, and the very elements of human excellence, are written with such celestial brightness that he that runs may read. Now to divert the heart from these to idle speculations and conjectures on the mysteries of providence or some of the remote heights and depths of Heaven's past or future designs respecting angels, men, or demons, &c. &c. seems to be the fifth essence of folly. How these speculations alienate the ears from truth to fables, the following sketch from the Winter Evenings of Maria Paschal may show:—

'In the township of Minerva once flourished the delightful society known for some years by the name of the Church of Edessa. It was a congregation of about one hundred and twenty strong, and included sixteen entire households, besides a number of young and even aged members of families belonging to other religious communities. These sixteen families were indeed generally exemplary; but a few of them were known through all the country as houses of prayer and sacred song. The melody of praise around their family altar was as regular as the morning and evening sacrifice in the ancient temple of the Lord, and the affairs of the kingdom of Jesus were dearer to them than their personal and domestic concerns.

'Things progressed most prosperously in this way for some five or six years, and all was peace and brotherly kindness among themselves; while their acts of benevolence, both in their individual and social relations, to those without, especially to the destitute and afflicted, won for them the esteem and even the admiration of all the surrounding community.

'But at length appeared among them a brother from Newfoundland, of good moral reputation and of very respectable attainments. He was well received by the whole church, and for some time they were all exceedingly happy in his company. But, being called upon one afternoon for an address at a prayer-meeting, in a place where a number of brethren were wont to convene for cultivating piety and a more perfect acquaintance with the Book of God, he introduced a favorite speculation on the extent of our present and future participation in the sin of Adam, and on the nature and extent of that depravity which has been communicated to all his posterity. Question after question arose about moral evil—its introduction into the universe, and God's designs and provisions, until the prayer-meeting became rather a debating club: for there were three young men who took sides with the strange brother;

Digitized by Google

while some of the elder brethren sought to correct their alleged aberrations and to reclaim them from these unprofitable speculations. But their efforts did not avail.

'It got into the congregation; and through their inexperience in such matters, both sides of these questions found favor with different members of the church; and in a little time these opinions were on every one's tongue. Songs and social prayers and works of benevolence were exchanged for discussions upon God's original purposes, the philosophy of man's apostacy, and upon the nature of 'transferred and inherent depravity,' until all the life and power of religion seemed to have forsaken the church. Even the discourses on the Lord's day partook of these curious speculations. Meetings became cold and uninteresting—no new converts—some of the old died—some removed away—some absented themselves from the meetings of the brethren and frequented the popular assemblies, until the church stood for a year at from forty-five to fifty, and would have been wholly extinguished had not the Lord called hence the sower of this discord, in the midst of such circumstances as to break the charm of his influence. But the Church of Edessa, like a tree scathed with the lightning of heaven, stands a monument of the folly of turning aside from the word of God to the speculations of proud, conceited, and ignorant men.'

A. C.

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 268.]

THE DIALOGUE, (*concluded.*)

Agenor. THE confession that Christ is the Messiah the Son of God, which you Christians make at baptism, is, I perceive, associated in your remembrance with incidents of an affecting character. In relation to the miraculous evidence upon which it rests, I would be happy to hear you further. You have already observed that it is in the motive or immediate design of Christ's miracles we see the divine attributes of benevolence and wisdom, while in the miracle itself we have a display of divine power. I perceive that the moving cause or purpose affords a good criterion by which to discriminate between miracles performed by a good being, and such as are wrought by a malignant one. And I have been much interested in this; for we have in Cyprus a magician

Digitized by Google

called Bar-jesus,* who is of your own nation, and who is greatly extolled for prodigies which he has performed by his knowledge of the secret powers of nature, or the aid of an invisible being, and for his skill in foretelling future things. I have myself witnessed his power in the infliction of certain strange disorders upon some who opposed his pretensions as a prophet. But none of the wonders which are related of him are to be compared with the miracles of Christ which you have described to me, neither was the reason of them benevolent or worthy.

Cleopas. Ah! my Agenor, it is easy to distinguish the power of God from the cunning artifices and devices of wicked men. The miracles of Christ were of such a character as to astonish and convince his most violent enemies;† while the goodness which directed the exercise of his power touched the hearts of many.

Agenor. You have related to me some wonderful cures which he performed from the feeling of compassion, and have explained to me those other miracles the reason of which I did not before perceive. Tell me, now, did he ever perform miracles from other motives than those which you have already spoken of?

Cleopas. He did. No reason seemed to weigh more with the Lord than an exhibition of faith on the part of those who desired the benefit of his power. He seemed to take delight in signalizing every display of that confidence which is so acceptable to God. And when, on the other hand, persons manifested unbelief and hardness of heart, he was hindered from performing miracles. This was the case at Nazareth, where he healed only a few sick, and this from motives of pity. So great a favor as a deliverance from sickness and pain, from blindness, from the power of demons or from death, in a moment and by a single word, it did not become him to confer upon those who were incapable of conviction, and alienated from the love of God. He it is who rewards those who put their trust in him; and without faith it is impossible to please him. Therefore, as the Messiah withheld his instructions from the Pharisees, veiling them in parables so that they might not understand, and confounding their assumed wisdom; so also did he withhold from unbelievers the blessing of miraculous deliverance from disease.

* Acts xiii. 6. † John xi. 47.

Digitized by Google

You have heard of the miracle wrought upon the servant of the centurion at Capernaum. Here the Lord Jesus was moved by the representations of the Jewish elders informing him that this centurion loved our nation and had built their synagogue, and testifying that he was worthy of the favor; but more particularly by the *confidence* he displayed in declaring that the Lord needed not to come to the house, but merely to speak the word, inasmuch as he had authority and control over disease, equal to that which he himself had over his soldiers.* Thus too he blessed the woman who touched the tuft of his mantle in the midst of the crowd, believing that she would be healed thereby. And, lest she or others to whom she might relate her cure should suppose it unknown to him, or attribute it to any other cause, he turned round, inquiring who touched him; and having induced her to declare what she had done and how she had been healed, reassured her, and referred the miracle to its proper motive, saying, "Thy *faith* hath cured thee."† It was usual with him also, when solicited to exert his power, to ask the suppliant, "Do you *believe* that I can do this?"‡ in order that faith might be justly appreciated and understood as the immediate inducement to bestow the blessing. It was for the same reason that he said, "Be it to you according to your faith."

But the case of the Syrophenician woman renders this still more conspicuous. You must know that the mission of Messiah was to our nation. To us belong the covenants and the rites of service and the promises, God having chosen our fathers to be a peculiar people, to the praise of his great name. Our Lord came therefore to his own people, who nevertheless did not receive him, but fulfilled the declaration of the Prophets in condemning him, he being delivered into their hands by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God that his gracious purposes might be accomplished. Now it happened that Jesus withdrew from the multitude, upon a certain occasion, into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and entered into a house to conceal himself,§ the reason of which I have already explained to you. But a woman belonging to a Grecian family hearing of him, came, and threw herself at his feet, entreating him that he would cast the demon out of her daughter. And such was her perseverance and un-

* Luke viii. † Matth. ix. ‡ Id. ib. § Mark viii. 24.

Digitized by Google

doubting confidence, and such also the readiness and justness of her reply, when he urged that the blessings of his ministry were designed only for the house of Israel, that he at length consented, exclaiming, "O, woman, great is thy faith! Be it to you as you desire." And that instant her daughter was healed.*

In this instance our Lord even transcended the bounds of his mission to reward faith, and render conspicuous the value and importance of the means by which alone we can approach Him who is invisible. For it is through faith in God that we enter upon the enjoyment of the divine favor, and receive even the forgiveness of sins. At Nazareth, the Lord once said to a paralytic, (perceiving the faith of those who conveyed him into his presence, for not being able to get through the crowd, they went upon the roof, and removing the *awning*† of the court where Jesus taught, let him down with cords,) "Son, take courage, your sins are forgiven you." And when some of the Scribes murmured in secret at this, he, knowing their thoughts, inquired, "Which is easier to say, Your sins are forgiven, or, Arise and walk," thus intimating that the only trouble was the uttering of the words; while to show that the effect would equally follow in either case, and the different blessings of pardon and of healing be equally enjoyed upon the same faith, he proceeded to utter the other sentence, the effect of which only could be visible. "Arise," said he, "take up your bed and go home." Instantly the paralytic was perfectly restored, and rising up in their presence, took up his bed, and returned home, glorifying God.‡

Agenor. How strange and wonderful! But you observed that the miracles of Christ proved that God had sent him, and thus produced faith. Did he then both produce faith and reward it by miracles?

Cleopas. Even so. Hence the first miracle which he wrought was chiefly to display power,§ in order that men might have an evidence of his divine mission. Afterwards, those who manifested faith in him from the evidences presented of his divine character, were distinguished by his favor, and healed of their diseases.

Agenor. This first miracle of which you speak, was, I believe, the turning the water into wine at Cana of Galilee. I have heard

* Matth. xv. 21—28. † Calmet, p. 478. ‡ Luke v. 18—26. § John ii. 11.

Digitized by Google

it related. It was indeed a surprising miracle, and one in which there could be no deception. In the beautiful island of Andros, which I once visited, there is a renowned temple consecrated to Bacchus, where once every year at the same hour, a little stream of water which issues from the temple is changed into wine.—This prodigy is repeated for seven successive days,* and the people, tasting of these streams, pay unbounded adoration to the god at whose command they are believed to flow. But I perceived that the priests of the temple, who were well acquainted with the channels through which these waters flowed, could easily thus impose upon the credulity of the multitude, and that it was their interest to deceive them.† But it is far otherwise with regard to the amiable character you have described to me, and the mighty works which he performed.

Cleopas. The idolatrous priests practise many artifices to deceive the people. Our Lord pleased not himself, but gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity.

As the conversation here ceased, both seeming to be absorbed in earnest thought, I said to my guide: The Mormonites and other impostors who have pretended to miraculous power, have sometimes attempted to work a miracle and failed. They have endeavored to excuse the failure by saying that it was because the diseased person had not faith enough. I see, with regard to Christ, that the faith of the diseased person added nothing to his power, for he could command the unconscious dead to rise, and still the winds and waves, but that it was merely an inducement for him to bestow the benefit.

"You are right," replied he, "he possessed unlimited authority and never spoke in vain. The only instance in which a failure occurred when a miracle was attempted to be wrought, was when his disciples tried to expel a demon during his absence upon the mount of transfiguration. But here the failure occurred, as in the case probably of those of whom you speak, not from any want of faith on the part of the person who requested the favor, but from the unbelief of those who endeavored to perform the miracle."‡

Cleopas and his companion who had resumed their conversa-

* Plin. lib. 2. c. 103. † Travels of Anacharsis, vol. iv. p. 186. ‡ Matth. xvii.

Digitized by Google

tion, now turned into a more spacious street which led towards Mount Zion; and the former stopping at a house with a latticed window and a large balcony in front, observed, This is the dwelling of Mnason, who is also a Cyprian, and with whom the brethren often lodge.* We will enter. L.

POWER OF RELIGION—*NO. VI.*

EXTRACTS FROM FAMILY CONVERSATIONS.

My dear Eugenia, replied Mr. Hamilton to his excellent lady, I assent to your postulate that the eternal salvation of our children, so far as human instrumentality goes, is beyond expression the greatest, most weighty, and responsible concern of our lives; but is my attention to family worship an indispensable means to such an end?

Mrs. H. You do not, my dear husband, meet my arguments fairly. I did not say that it was an *indispensable means;* but I think it is a very common means—a very rational and religious means, and one of divine authority; and, moreover, I do not see that we can successfully use any other means if we neglect this one.

Mr. H. I did, indeed, once regard it as of divine authority, and felt very like making an effort to attend to it, shortly after my baptism, as you may remember; but you were then opposed to it, and Deacon Hunter said there was no Bible authority for it, and I knew he did not attend to it, and was nevertheless of high standing in the church: and now, if I am wrong, you, my dear Eugenia, and Deacon Hunter are to blame for it: for I have no doubt that had I been encouraged by yourself or by him, I should have commenced, and by this time habit would have made it both easy and natural; but now, after having been a member of the church for five years, it will appear to my children and domestics not only a strange occurrence, but rather a censure upon myself and an avowal of hypocrisy in my former profession. I must therefore be convinced that it is my duty, by a very plain scripture warrant, before I can now commence the practice.

Mr. H. True, indeed, I did not much relish the idea when first you asked my views of it: for although then a professor of religion in the way I had been educated, I neither understood the gospel nor felt the love of God in my heart. But, my dear husband, you must not upbraid me with my former unbelief and hardness of heart: for you know it is

* Acts xxi. 16.

Digitized by Google

only a few months since I was baptized, and never before I heard brother Johnston had I any proper feelings upon the subject of religion. But now I am determined for eternal life; and having tasted that God is gracious, I wish all my children and domestics to share the same joys, and for this purpose to enjoy all the means of salvation—amongst which I must place family worship. Now as for Deacon Hunter, you know that he is, in some matters at least, very inconsiderate and inconsistent. Did you not tell me that Mr. Cynic said when he heard that Mr. Hunter had subscribed fifty dollars to the Burman mission, that it would require Dr. Spurzheim to prove to him that that man was not a mono-maniac who would pay fifty dollars to convert his antipodes, while his own children were as ignorant of the Bible and as free from moral restraint as some of those who had never been taught to read. But I see Deacon Hunter's carriage at the gate: he promised us a visit this week, and now I will have the subject up, by your permission, and we shall hear his defence.

[Deacon Hunter and his lady enter, and after tea Mr. Hamilton introduces the subject.]

Mr. H. Mrs. Hamilton and myself were engaged in a friendly discussion, since dinner, on the subject of family worship; and as I appealed to you for authority in the case, she has enjoined me to inquire of you your reasons for opposing the practice; for she is exceedingly solicitous that we should bring our family under that dispensation.

Deacon Hunter. I am not disposed to argue with Mrs. Hamilton against family worship: I only say, that I cannot find any thing said about it in the sacred scriptures; and were it one of the means of grace, as Parson Clement teaches, I think it strange that the Bible should say nothing about it.

Mrs. H. The Bible does not indeed name "family worship;" but neither does it speak of "closet worship." Is there no closet worship then?

Deacon H. We are told to enter into our closet and shut the door, and pray to our Father who seeth in secret. And this is authority enough for "secret prayer" or "closet worship," I judge.

Mr. H. And might not two or more persons enter into the same room or closet, and unite in asking the Lord for such blessings as they need? You may call it closet or room prayer, or family prayer. We do not ask for positive commandments except for positive ordinances. Why ask for a precept for praying in rooms, houses, families, any more than for a precept to teach our children to read the Bible? And I think you will no more find the command, '*Read the Bible*,' or, '*Teach your children to read the Bible;*' I say, you will no more find these commands in the Bible than the command, 'Worship God in your families.' Then why

Digitized by Google

insist upon the one more than the other? Is the one duty not as imperative as the other? If, then, you will have heads of families to read the Bible and to teach their children to read the Bible without any such command, then, I ask, why object to their family prayers because you cannot find such a command in so many words?

Deacon H. If any terms indicative of the practice can be adduced, I will give up.

Mrs. H. Will you allow that social prayer among Christians is scriptural?

Deacon H. Yes, it is occasionally allowable; but I think it ought not to be stated, because it will become mere custom.

Mrs. H. Paul commands Christians to "pray always," and "I *will*," says he, "that men pray every where;" and again, "Pray always, with *all prayer* and supplication" Will not *praying always* become a custom! And did not the command, "Pray every where," include a family?

Deacon H. I know that Christians may, as such have social prayers as often as they please and where they please; but recollect this is *family prayer* of which we speak. And where shall we find this sort of prayer commanded or alluded to?

Mrs. H. It is spoken of 1 Peter iii. 7. Husbands and wives are commanded so to live in the marriage relation "that their prayers be not hindered." And surely if other Christians are allowed to unite in social prayers as often as they please, believing husbands and wives, believing parents and children may unite in social prayers as often as they please.

Deacon H. To this I do not object, provided unbelievers are not present; or, if present, are not compelled to go through the forms.

Mrs. H. I would not, indeed, expect unbelievers to have social prayers, or that unbelieving parents should have the forms of family worship; but are we not speaking of Christian parents? And why introduce those of another character?

Deacon H. Christian parents may pray by themselves; but I object to their praying in the presence of their children, as if for their sake.

Mrs. H. Does not our blessed Saviour pray for the sake of unbelieving Jews, when at the tomb of Lazarus he said, "For their sakes I said it,"—(I prayed,)—that they might know the God by whom he wrought such miracles. If, then, our Lord prayed in the presence of unbelievers for their conviction, why object to praying in the presence of our children and domestics for their conviction.

Deacon H. I do not think that our Lord's actions are always exemplary for us; and as this accompanied a miracle, I do not think we can argue from it a stated custom.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. H. But there is a moral meaning in all his actions which is not confined to a particular case; and are we not here taught that the name of God may be invoked in the presence of others for their conviction, without involving the question how often it may be done? And really there are some children of more than ten years old, the children of professors too, in this vicinity, that know not the attributes of the God their parents worship. It was not long since a lad, who told me he was eleven years old, stood overwhelmed in my presence when I asked him what God his father worshipped. The lad said 'he did not know, but thought there was but one God.' "But," said I, "is he an almighty, an omnipotent, all-seeing God, whom your father addresses in his prayers?" "I never heard father pray," was his reply.

Deacon H. But, Mrs. Hamilton, can you not find some place where the Apostles, either by precept or by their example, clearly taught that Christians might lawfully pray in the presence of their children?

Mrs. H. This would appear as unnecessary as to ask for a command to pray for one's children. Could Deacon Hunter give me from Christ or the Apostles a command to pray for one's children, or adduce a single example that Peter or any of the Apostles ever prayed for their wives or children? But I can even give an example that reaches the case you propose. Luke informs us that when Paul was about to depart from Tyre, (Acts xxi. 4—6.) the disciples accompanied him with their wives and children; "And," says he, "they all brought us on our way with wives and children till we were out of the city, (Tyre;) and *we kneeled down on the shore and prayed.*" Did they forbid the children to kneel down by the sides of their fathers and mothers? Surely that kind-hearted Paul that felt the ties of nature so forcibly as to have "continual sorrow on his heart" for his Jewish brethren, and to offer "prayers to God for Israel that they might be saved," would here pray for the wives and children of these disciples who thus accompanied him and his companions to the shore!

Deacon H. That is one passage of scripture I confess I never noticed before. I have read it without observation. Still it appears an extraordinary case, else Luke would not have told it.

Mrs. H. So, then, with you it is an extraordinary case that prayer in the presence of the families of the disciples should not be commanded nor exemplified in the New Testament; and it is also an extraordinary case when it is exemplified! What a strange sort of book would the Bible have been had it met the views of all mankind!

Mrs. Hunter. Indeed, Mrs. Hamilton, I must tell you that Mr. Hunter is now of your opinion: for the last six months he has attended to family prayer and reading the scriptures. And I will tell you how this

Digitized by Google

came to pass:—None of our children have joined the church, and indeed they do not seem much inclined even to go to meeting; whereas all Mr. King's children have been baptized, and are walking very orderly in the faith. My husband used to say, "I do not know how my neighbor Mr. King gets along so well in the world, with so small a farm and so large a family. He spends an hour every morning and evening reading and expounding the scriptures and praying with his family, while it requires most of us to push our business all the day "to provide things honest in the sight of all men." But on seeing the difference between Mr. King's family and the other families in our neighborhood, it has led my husband and myself to reconsider our objections to this practice, and we have been so far satisfied that it is at least a useful custom, as to begin, and as to sincerely repent that we had not begun twenty years ago. And had it not been for a Sandemanian tract which fell into our hands more than twenty years since, we no doubt would have commenced family worship shortly after we made a profession of the faith.

Deacon H. I have indeed commenced the practice, and feel much pleased with it so far; yet I cannot say that all my difficulties are removed, and therefore I have thrown the proof on Mrs. Hamilton.

Mr. Hamilton. Well, you have so far interested me as to desire a more full consideration of the subject, and therefore I propose to invite Mr. and Mrs. King to my house on next Wednesday evening, and we shall hear their experience on the subject. Can Mr. and Mrs. Hunter favor us with their presence at that time?

Deacon H. On so important an occasion we shall endeavor to attend.

A. C.

LETTERS TO ENGLAND—*No. V.*

BETHANY, Va. September 27th, 1837.

MR. J. WALLIS:

Dear Sir—I WAS ready to commence the second chapter of the book of reformation, or to proceed to the second item of my distribution of the whole subject of religious reformation; but, in the mean time, and since my last letter to you, I had the pleasure to receive five numbers of your "*Christian Messenger*," from April to August inclusive. And from these, and some other accompanying documents, to my astonishment I learn that our venerable and much esteemed brother Jones has found it expedient to caution the English public against my views on three points of doctrine, in which he says, "Mr. Campbell has depart-

Digitized by Google

ed from the form of sound words—the faith once delivered to the saints." These are, 1st. "The corruption of human nature, or the innate natural depravity of mankind." 2d. "The necessity of divine influence to give the gospel its saving effect in regeneration and sanctification." And 3d. "His maintaining the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and the actual washing away of sins by immersion."

His proof of the first is as follows:—

"Now as respects the first of these points, namely, 'the total depravity' of mankind, in consequence of the corruption of human nature, through the fall of our federal head, I am free to confess, that, if any thing contrary to the *received* doctrine on that subject is to be found in the 'Christian Baptist,' it has eluded my vigilance, and I think I have searched with some care. I admit, indeed, that we no where find Mr. Campbell stating the doctrine with the clearness, perspicuity, and power that is done in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, in the passages referred to in my last two sermons. Nevertheless, I have not found him any where in that work entering his protest against it; and my opinion is, that *at that time* he had no intention of impugning it. The first violent attack that I find made upon it in his publications, may be seen in the 'Millennial Harbinger,' vol. ii, for the year 1831, in which are three essays, signed 'Moses,' which are respectively entitled 'Total Depravity and Metaphysical Regeneration.' In these papers we are told that the phrase *'total depravity* was christened by Austin, baptized by Calvin, and immersed by Drs. Gill and Fuller'—p. 361. We are further informed that 'this doctrine is the HONEY of a poisoned cup, and the sting of a serpent's embrace.' And, as though this were not enough, it is further added, that 'such heresy as this is worse than all the pride, avarice, ambition, and lewdness, and all the other crimes which are committed in the land of orthodoxy. It is more deadly than the fangs and stings of the aspick'—p. 363.

"Now the reader will naturally expect that a writer who would not scruple to use language like this, as to a doctrine that has been currently received among Christians, according to his own confession, for fourteen or fifteen hundred years, would, as a matter of course, furnish us with a satisfactory explanation of those direct testimonies, both of Prophets and Apostles, which *appear* to us to inculcate the doctrine of 'human depravity,' such as Gen. vi. 5, and viii. 21: Psalm xiv. and li. 5: Rom. iii. *passim:* Eph. ii. 1—3, with many others: but we look in vain for any thing of that kind. The only thing attempted is to cull a few texts from the Old Testament, not one of which does he understand or rightly apply, seeing that they all refer to the Sinai Covenant, and its temporal blessings; though adduced by the writer to prove the liberty of the human will, and that man has the power and ability to repent and turn to God without divine aid!

"I am aware, however, that it will be objected to me, that the Editor of a periodical cannot justly be held accountable for every sentiment that may be contained in the writings of those who contribute to his journal; and that unless it can be proved that the person who signs himself 'Moses' is Alexander Campbell, my complaints go for nothing.

"Now this I freely admit,—that I do not believe Mr. Campbell was the writer of those three papers. I believe they were written by his

Digitized by Google

friend Walter Scott, of Carthage, in the state of Ohio; and shall produce my reasons for thinking so.

"I have now lying before me a publication of which that gentleman is the Editor, entitled, 'The Evangelist,' and in vol. iii, p. 51, I find a DIALOGUE, relating to this same subject, from which I shall produce a short extract:—

'*Jonathan*—Sir, it would gratify your humble servant not a little, to know precisely what are your views of human depravity, and the relation of that doctrine to the gospel, as preached for the remission of sins.

'*Editor*—My dear Jonathan, I am happy it is permitted, nay, even enjoined us by our holy religion, to study to please, and to edify each other in the great matters of faith and hope. The doctrine about which you inquire, however, comes not within the purview of either faith or hope, and cannot, therefore, form a legitimate topic of Christian conversation. In fact, it has no foundation either in nature or religion, so far as I am a judge; for neither the phrase, nor even the words which form the phrase, are once found in the Holy Scriptures; and, in short, I know nothing about it.

'*Jonathan*—Brother Scott, you surprise me; are you a preacher of the gospel, and know nothing of human depravity? And is it possible that neither the phrase, nor the words that compose the phrase, are found in the whole field of the divine vocabulary? I must have mistaken the phrase: yes, it was total depravity I meant.

'*Editor*—My dear Jonathan, pardon me; but I know nothing about depravity human or total: the word *total* is as perfectly an exotic in the field of Christian theology, as the word human, or even depravity itself. None of all of them is a Bible word, and therefore their use is very questionable; at all events I know nothing about the doctrine, and it is most certain 'I care nothing about it.'

"This; I think it will be allowed on all hands, is pretty pointed and explicit! But, had the same question been put to the Apostle Paul, does the reader think that he would have returned the same answer? Nay, verily; we may easily judge what answer he would have returned, by a reference to Rom. iii. and Eph. ii.; and if Mr. Walter Scott neither knows nor cares any thing about 'human depravity,' he is a very unfit man to preach the gospel; at any rate, *his* gospel cannot be the identical,—original gospel, the

'Sov'reign balm for every wound,
And cordial for our fears,'

which the first heralds of salvation proclaimed: for in their message of peace and reconciliation, the doctrine of 'human depravity'—total depravity, and the gospel of divine grace, answered to each other, as disease and remedy."

Now, the good old brother has forgotten himself here, and in his own remarks, in his own Millennial Harbinger, refutes this calumny against me. He there says, "It is said Mr. C. denies the doctrine of total depravity. I am free to confess, that if any thing contrary to the received doctrine on this subject is to be found in the Christian Baptist, it has eluded my vigilance, and I think I have searched with some care; and although there are three essays on that subject in the Millennial Har

Digitized by Google

binger, signed 'Moses,' I do not believe Mr. Campbell was the writer of them; and the editor of a periodical cannot surely be held accountable for every sentiment that may be contained in the writings of those who contribute to his journal." Thus *brother* Jones refutes himself on the first article of the three.

Our good brother is right in alleging that I am not 'Moses'; but he is wrong in supposing that 'Moses' is brother Walter Scott. Besides, I have never endorsed for 'Moses' nor brother Scott, nor have they for me. I think that they have not been happy in expressing themselves upon the subject, nor sufficiently respectful in their manner of speaking of an opinion held so sacred by so many learned and pious Protestants, and for so long a time. But, after all that has been said about "the form of sound words," where shall we find in that form of sound words the phrases "innate depravity," "total depravity," or "horeditary depravity?" And can it be possible that brother Jones identifies our opposition to these sectarian technicalities with an opposition to "the faith once delivered to the saints," or "the form of sound words"?—Then, indeed, he has attentively read neither the Christian Baptist nor the Millennial Harbinger.

An attentive reader of our works must doubtless perceive that one of the capital points of that reformation for which we plead in order to the union of all Christians, is the restoration of "*a pure speech.*" The pure dialect of the kingdom of heaven has been as completely corrupted and lost in the long captivity of the New Testament Babylon, as the pure Hebrew of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Samuel, and David, (the ancient speech of the commonwealth of Israel,) was corrupted in Chaldea during the seventy years captivity in the Old Testament Babylon. As Ezra, at the era of the return to Jerusalem, had often to expound the sense and make the people understand the reading of the sacred writings by an expurgation of the Chaldean dialect and a substitution of the pure old Hebrew phrase; so we now, in order to the return of Christians to the primitive institution of Christ, have to purify the speech of Christians by an expulsion of "the language of Ashdod," and a substitution of the pure old apostolic phrase. Hence our first canon in the work of reformation is, CALL BIBLE THINGS BY BIBLE NAMES.

Observation and reflection have established in my mind a very full conviction that a very large portion of all the errors in religious doctrine and faith have arisen from an effort to give new names to Bible ideas, or to mend the diction of the Spirit. This improvement of the sacred nomenclature has commonly issued in a new class of ideas, rather than in a new class of names for old ideas; for a very general rule with us is, CHANGE THE TERMS AND YOU CHANGE THE IDEAS: and so it came to pass

Digitized by Google

that when the Alexandrian School of Theology had completed its improvements of the Bible style, a race of foreign and barbarous terms and phrases over-run Christendom; and these, still farther improved by a thousand controversies about untaught and curious questions, had, before the era of the Lutheran Reformation, usurped almost the whole area of religious faith and knowledge, and had banished from the vocabulary of Christian doctrine the pure and uncorrupt style of the undegenerate age of the inspired Apostles.

Another discovery that has obtruded itself upon us, is,—that, very generally, *when the phrase is not found in the Bible, the exact idea which it represents is not found there;* and hence most of the consecrated style of scholastic theology communicates ideas somewhat different from those suggested by the Holy Spirit.

Again, a still more evident consideration forbids the continuance of this unhallowed phraseology; for is it not most obvious that a large portion of these phrases have been the bitter roots of discord and division among Christians—indeed, that most of the Protestant sects have been occasioned and perpetuated by them?

These allusions to our views and course of procedure in reference to modern partyism, explain the license that we have taken in repudiating such barbarous phrases as "total depravity," "hereditary depravity," "innate depravity," &c. &c. But how our brother Jones, with these facts relative to our views and manners before him, could identify opposition to these barbarisms with an opposition to the Bible doctrine of the Fall and Apostacy Man, has been to us rather a confounding problem.—Surely the good old brother does not insinuate that these phrases are any part of "the form of sound words," or of "the faith delivered to the saints"!!

It is not necessary to that reformation which we plead, that we disprove the truth of any doctrine represented by these technical and sectarian terms and phrases: we only have to say, that they are *unauthorized, unscriptural, and schismatical.* Sometimes, indeed, we have attempted this, but only for the purpose of showing that they ought to be reprobated simply on the ground that they are not scriptural: for if these great and leading designations of ideas are not scriptural, as a general rule, we affirm that the ideas which they represent are human, and not divine. As a specimen of this, rather than as an argument on the subject of depravity, we superadd the following remarks on the extract from the strictures of Father Jones.

I never have dogmatized on the subject of the fall of man, of his apostacy from God, nor on the extent of the corruption and depravity of his nature. I think, moreover, that a very superficial attention to my writings will satisfy any candid person that I am not afraid to avow my

Digitized by Google

sentiments on any unpopular tenet, and that there is no need for constructive error or heresy as respects my views. I have not the fear of any man before my eyes; and if I entertained any views of a practical nature on that or any other subject greatly different from the more "evangelical sects," I should not fail to hazard the avowal of them.—But to proceed:—

The phrase "total depravity" is sectarian and indefinite. Whether the *totality* apply to the *depravity* or to the powers of man, is not at all understood by the multitude, nor explained by a majority of the Rabbims. That man is fallen in body, soul, and spirit—that his perception, reflection, and moral powers are impaired by the fall, I believe and teach. But that he is totally depraved as respects the *nature* of the depravity, is not only unscriptural, but absurd. I care not who affirms: for then the new-born infant is as depraved as the veriest monster in human form. If *total* refer to the heart or affections of man, it is admissable; but if to the extent or nature of depravity, it is wholly inadmissable; and I have greatly overrated the discernment of brother Jones if he does not concur with me.

"Total depravity" with me is like total debility. *Total* applies to the subject of the disease, and not to the disease itself. *Debility* has degrees, but *total* has not. *Total debility* and *total depravity* are barbarous phrases; they have not the congruity of language, of reason, nor of religion in their favor. I may say a man is totally diseased that is disabled in every limb, muscle and nerve; yet I cannot call his disease a total disease: neither can I call his depravity total depravity, although his body, soul, and spirit are impaired by Adam's apostacy.

But again, *depravity* will not apply to the body nor to the understanding of man. We do not say that a man's body is depraved, nor that his perceptive and reflective powers are depraved. Depravity belongs to the heart, or to the will and the affections. Therefore the totality of depravity is confined to one class of human powers. How, then, can we say that human nature is totally depraved! Can we even say that the human heart is totally depraved in any other sense than as respects all its affections? Even when confined to the heart, it does not express degrees of depravity. Still amongst those that are totally depraved in heart, there are some more and less depraved. Equal depravity is not total depravity. The totally depraved are unequally depraved in the true and proper import of language.

The same reason and law of language that forbid "total depravity," also forbid "hereditary depravity." Depravity cannot be, like the scrofula, hereditary: for then the subject of it would be guiltless.—Who ever was condemned because he was born black, blind, scrofu-

Digitized by Google

lous, or degenerate! And what law or reason can condemn a person for being born depraved, if depravity be as hereditary as the king's evil?

But the human heart is born with a susceptibility of being "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked;" and in many instances, though not always, it actually becomes so. In the human family there are some men of a much more noble and honorable nature than others. The Bereans were much more noble than the Thessalonians before either of them were converted to God.* David constitutionally was a much better man than Saul; yet their hearts, in consequence of the apostacy, were susceptible of being made "desperately wicked." So far the Bible and human experience and observation go. But in their zeal for orthodoxy some men have written and spoken about hereditary total depravity not only to outrage every law of human language and the meaning of words, but also to confound all natural and constitutional differences amongst men, and even to make it impossible for them to become any worse than they were at birth.

As brother Jones has sufficiently neutralized his own suspicions and imputations, as respects myself, in the extracts quoted from his own pen, I now only apologize for the boldness of some of my correspondents whose zeal may have betrayed them into indiscreet expressions; and who, indeed, may have asserted more than they could prove. I have no doubt, brother Wallis, that you will be able, from my writings in your possession, to satisfy all your readers that brother Jones in the other two items has been equally premature as in the case before us; nay, more, that his caution is as unnecessary as his commendation of me to his readers has been too high. I trust that English and Scotch men will not be too much influenced by the one or the other, but examine and judge for themselves.

Very sincerely and affectionately,

A. CAMPBELL.

EXCURSIONS—*No. II.*

Brother Campbell,

Public speaking has great influence over men, and this influence is felt perhaps more in this country than in any other. We Americans are emphatically a nation of public speakers. Here, almost any occasion, from a toast at a dinner-table to a question of the greatest national concern, is sufficient to justify a speech. And here any thing will do for a *rostrum*, whether it be

* Acts xvii. 11

Digitized by Google

a stage or a pulpit, a bench or a chair, a table or a stump. In fact I once saw a man six feet high addressing the multitude from the top of a pump three feet taller than himself. Throughout the length and breadth of the land, indeed, there is scarcely a neighborhood in which there is not every week an address delivered upon some topic, political, social, or religious. It is doubtless to the nature of our institutions that this peculiarity is owing. The right of universal suffrage, eligibility to office, liberty and equality, give boldness and inspiration alike to the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, and the statesman.

Of the two great engines by which the community is moved—the Press, and the Voice, the latter is probably the most potent. It is certainly superior in giving effect to conviction; in rousing up the dormant energies of men, and adding additional impulse to their activities. There is no system, however absurd, which cannot be sustained by it. If there be but a sufficient number of public speakers employed in behalf of the most unpopular cause, it will advance, in spite of the weight it has to carry.

> "Thus forc'd from *wind*-guns, LEAD ITSELF will fly,
> "And POND'ROUS SLUGS cut swiftly through the sky."

We have indeed many fine castles built upon *air* in these days;—many showy theories so light and inflated, that, like balloons, they have borne both themselves and their authors to the clouds;—many *wind-mills* which are often absurdly mistaken for GIANTS. Fallacy and error, however, depend more than truth upon such aid for their propagation. The gracefully bending ear of wheat pours out the valued grain at the foot of the stalk:—it is the seed of the noxious thistle, which, by the help of its downy beard, floats upon the air and spreads itself abroad.

It is by means of *preaching* that the various parties into which unhappy Christendom is divided, have endeavored to support themselves. Camp meetings, protracted meetings, &c. have been resorted to in order to make proselytes; the "drum ecclesiastic" has been loudly sounded for recruits to fill ranks thinned by the sword of the Spirit. But those who march under the banner of primitive Christianity have continued to triumph; led on indeed by a few devoted public laborers, but chiefly assisted by the force of Truth. Hence our brethren in this state are more

Digitized by Google

numerous at present than any other religious denomination, so far as I can learn.

The excitability of the public having been some time ago exhausted by those protracted meetings which formerly produced the boasted "revivals of religion," the charm of novelty has been lately tried in a new species of meetings called "*union meetings*," which appear to me not a little singular. These meetings are formed by a sort of 'Holy Alliance' between two or more of the contending parties, who unite their forces for a certain period, say from two to six weeks, after which they divide the spoil; when the cry is again heard, "To your tents, O Israel!" Happy, indeed, would I be if a real union could be effected among professed Christians; but this temporary armistice, after which each party rallies again around its own standard, is but a shallow pretence—a mere mockery of that perfect and abiding union which existed among the first converts to Christianity.

One of these meetings was in progress at Crab Orchard when I arrived there in company with brother Calahan, a devoted and efficient laborer, who came to fulfil some appointments made by him for this place a month previously. The ministers who were conducting this meeting, and who were of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian persuasion, strove assiduously to get up an excitement, and sought to oppose our sentiments by misrepresenting them. One of the most conspicuous among them was a Mr. Goodnight; of whose *goodness* I make no question, but who is certainly very much *in the dark* as it regards a correct knowledge of our sentiments, and of the gospel as preached by the Apostles. The custom at these meetings is, to preach the Spirit instead of the Word; to alarm the fears of the people by the terrors of the law, rather than to excite their hopes by the promises of the gospel; to work upon the passions, rather than to inform the judgment; and, by the most urgent appeals and personal solicitations, to persuade as many as possible of the auditors to come to the mourning benches, where, by dint of preaching, praying, singing, and shouting, they are finally wrought up to an ecstacy, which they are taught to regard as the certain evidence of the pardon of their sins, and an admission into the kingdom of heaven. In this way many are converted who are almost en-

Digitized by Google

tirely ignorant of the Bible; cannot give a sensible or scriptural answer to those who ask a reason for the hope which is in them, and are never made to realize the importance of a conformity to the Divine character.

Far be it from me to oppose religious feelings. It is in religion that the most excited feelings are justifiable; for its motives are of so exalted a nature that the liveliest transport can never amount to enthusiasm. Its rejoicing is a "joy unspeakable and full of glory." But let it be preceded and produced by a fair exhibition and reception of "*the truth.*" Let faith be founded upon the *divine* testimony rather than upon the words of *men;* let the Holy Spirit be received through *faith*, rather than the the spirit of a party through *credulity*; and let the heart be touched and purified by the *love* of God, rather than the imagination moved by fictitious *terrors*. These "union meetings" no doubt alarm some careless sinners, and the partial exhibition of truth presented has a more or less beneficial effect. But it is questionable whether they do not more harm than good to religion with the thinking part of the community, by their obvious dependence upon animal excitement for their success, rather than upon the force of evidence and reason.

Such, however, is the influence of long-continued public speaking, that many converts are made at these meetings and afterwards divided among the sects—thus perpetuating the present distracted state of the religious community. Converts made in this way by the joint labors of several different parties, appear to me in a singular attitude. One would think they should possess a peculiar nature, in accordance with the laws of paternity and maternity. Religiously, they ought to be born, like Cerberus, with at least three tongues, that they might speak "a *leash* of languages at once." Perhaps our brethren wish in this way to restore again to the church the "gift of tongues" as on Pentecost. But if so, do they not mistake the matter? Would it not, think you, be more like the gift bestowed at *Babel*,

> ..... "the huge tow'r which builders vain
> "Presumptuous pil'd on Shinar's plain"?

How is it possible for these converts to know whether they should say *shibboleth* or *sibboleth?* * * * * * * * * *
Alas for these divisions? for this party spirit! for that "golden

Digitized by Google

cup in the hand of the Lord that has made all the earth drunken"! O that Babylon were "fallen and destroyed—her broad walls broken and her high gates consumed"! O that the Lord would plead the cause of Zion, and rebuild her ruined places!—How happifying it would be if all who believe in Christ were united in 'one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all'!—if the world believed that Jesus was the Messiah!—if every one we meet upon the road were our brother; every house we enter, our home; and every home a heaven, where the high praises of God are heard, and where in place of human opinions and errors, the theme is the glory of the Divine character!

They who are blessed with the knowledge of primitive Christianity, and of those principles upon which alone union can be effected and perpetuated, should rouse themselves to greater diligence. So various are the means employed, and so indefatigable tho exertions used to sustain partyism, both by the press and by the tongue, that our brethren should bestir themselves in behalf of union. Since public speaking has so much power, as many laborers as possible should be sent into the field. Kentucky owes much to those faithful and devoted evangelists who have borne the burden and heat of a day of persecution, but have now reason to rejoice in the fruit of their labors, and the prosperity of the cause which they have loved. I am happy to find also that the liberality of the churches is such as to support and encourage them in the good work. O that they were still more liberal, and that the churches in some other places were as liberal as they! But unfortunately we have some brethren who it seems to me would make the very gospel itself, which was founded in philanthropy, the source of selfish enjoyment. They imagine that the church is not to pay regard to the conversion of the world, but only to her own internal affairs, and that a mere display of what they ignorantly call 'church order' is every thing that is necessary. They suppose that they are to sit still and wait just like a spider in his web until sinners come as it were just on purpose to be converted. But as few attend their dull and formal meetings, their light is that of a *dark lantern*, or, at best,

..... "a lamp to light
"Those only who see nothing by't."

Digitized by Google

Even if the affairs of such a church were well regulated, which they never can be with such contracted views, it would not be "the pillar and support of the truth"—the means of causing the gospel to "sound forth." It would be like a clock, the wheels and internal machinery of which moved indeed with accuracy and precision, but which had neither a bell to strike the hours, nor hands to point them out, so that no one could tell by it the time of day.

We have others too who are in favor of preaching, and who remember that in the beginning "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe," who nevertheless are singularly forgetful, careless, or indifferent as it regards the support of the evangelist and his family. These persons are indeed generally the most anxious for "preaching." They overwhelm the public laborer with their urgent solicitations—"When will you visit us?" "When will you speak for us?" "Can you not let us make some appointments for preaching in our village?" If their requests are granted, they attend the meeting, receive the instruction given, and enjoy the "preaching," and then act as if they supposed that the preacher could live on preaching—live, not merely on *wind*, but upon *his own wind*. Such persons have yet to learn that the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," would be as true in their case as in that of the preacher, and that they can only have "fruit that will abound to their account," or be "children of God" by imitating Him "who gives to all men liberally."

If the churches every where would duly sustain the proclamation of the gospel, the truth would triumph in all places as it does in Kentucky. Some of the laborers in this state are remarkably successful. Among these J. T. Johnson is conspicuous, whose praise is in all the churches. His perseverance is great. He conquers opposition by the force of his zeal, or disarms it by the warmth of his benevolence. And so evident is his sincerity and philanthropy, that, while others by *reasoning* move the *heads* of the audience, he touches their *hearts* with his *own heart*. He was just concluding a meeting at May's Lick when I arrived, at which about twenty made the good confession. I attended a meeting with him at Richmond in Madison county, a few days

Digitized by Google

afterwards. Upwards of twenty were added to the churches in that vicinity by his labors in the course of eight or ten days.—Brother Scott visited that region soon after; baptized ten, and sowed much good seed. I have since heard that brother J. T. Johnson returned subsequently to the same county, and, at a protracted meeting, assisted by other laborers, has baptized one hundred and eighty-three persons into the ancient faith.

R. R.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.

In an article on a query from Lunenburg, which appeared in the September number, certain sentences have been objected to by some two or three intelligent and much esteemed correspondents. We gave it as our *opinion* that there were Christians among the Protestant sects; an opinion, indeed, which we have always expressed when called upon. If I mistake not, it is distinctly avowed in our first Extra on Remission; yet it is now supposed by these brethren that I have conceded a point of which I have hitherto been tenacious, and that I have misapplied certain portions of scripture in supporting said opinion. In the article alluded to, we have said that we "cannot make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even Christian immersion," &c. Again, we have said that "there is no occasion for making immersion on a profession of the faith absolutely essential to a Christian, though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort." These two sentences contain the pith and marrow of the objectionable portion of said article, to which we again refer the reader.

Much depends upon the known temper and views of a querist in shaping an answer to his questions. This was the case in this instance. We apprehended that the propounder of the queries that called for these remarks, was rather an ultraist on the subject of Christian baptism; so far at least as not to allow that the name *Christian* is at all applicable to one unimmersed, or even to one immersed, without the true intent and meaning of baptism in his understanding previous to his burial in water. This we gathered from her epistle; and of course gave as bold an answer as we ever gave—perhaps more bold than on any former occasion, yet nothing differing from our former expressed views on that subject.

My high regard for these correspondents, however, calls for a few remarks on those sentences, as farther explanatory of our

Digitized by Google

views. We cheerfully agree with them, as well as with our sister of Lunenburg, that the term *Christian* was given first to immersed believers and to none else; but we do not think that it was given to them because they were immersed, but because they had put on Christ; and therefore we presume to opine, that, like every other word in universal language, even this term may be used as Paul sometimes uses the words *saint* and *sinner*, *Jew* and *Gentile*—in a part of their signification.

We have, in Paul's style, the *inward* and the *outward* Jews; and may we not have the *inward* and the *outward* Christians? for true it is, that he is not always a Christian who is one outwardly: and one of my correspondents will say, 'Neither is he a Christian who is one inwardly.' But all agree that he is, in the full sense of the word, a Christian who is one inwardly and outwardly.

As the same Apostle reasons on circumcision, so we would reason on baptism:—"Circumcision," says the learned Apostle, "is not that which is outward in the flesh;" that is, as we apprehend the Apostle, it is not that which is outward in the flesh; but "circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter [only,] whose praise is of God, and not of man." So is baptism. It is not outward in the flesh only, but in the spirit also. We argue for the outward and the inward—the outward for men, including ourselves—the inward for God; but both the outward and the inward for the praise both of God and of men.

Now the nice point of opinion on which some brethren differ, is this: Can a person who simply, not perversely, *mistakes* the outward baptism, have the inward? We all agree that he who wilfully or negligently perverts the outward, cannot have the inward. But can he who, through a simple mistake, involving no perversity of mind, has misapprehended the outward baptism, yet submitting to it according to his view of it, have the inward baptism which changes his state and has praise of God, though not of all men? is the precise question. To which I answer, that, in my opinion, *it is possible.* Farther than this I do not affirm.

My reasons for this opinion are various; two of which we have have only time and space to offer at this time. Of seven difficulties it is the least; two of these seven, which, on a contrary hypothesis would occur, are insuperable:—*The promises concerning an everlasting Christian church* have failed; and then it would follow that not a few of the brightest names on earth of the last three hundred years should have to be regarded as subjects of the kingdom of Satan!!

None of our brethren regard baptism as only outward. They all believe that in the outward submersion of the body in the

Digitized by Google

water, there is at the same time the inward submersion of the mind and heart into Christ. They do moreover suppose that the former may be without the latter. They have only to add that it is possible for the latter to be not without the former in some sense, but without it in the sense which Christ ordained.

Still my *opinion* is no rule of action to my brethren, nor would I offer it unsolicited to any man. But while we inculcate faith, repentance, and baptism upon all, as essential to their constitutional citizenship in the Messiah's kingdom, and to their sanctification and comfort as Christians, no person has a right to demand our opinions on all the differences of this generation, except for his private gratification. He is certainly safer who obeys from the heart "that mould of doctrine" delivered to us by the Apostles; and he only has praise of God and man, and of himself *as a Christian*, who believes, repents, is baptized, and keeps all the ordinances, positive and moral, as delivered to us by the holy Apostles.

The scriptures quoted in the essay complained of, are all applied to the Christian *character*, and not to the Christian *state*, as contemplated by one of our correspondents. They are therefore not misapplied. It is hoped these general remarks will be satisfactory on this point. A. C.

Ohio River, Sept. 28th, 1837.

From the Apostolic Advocate.

PRESBYTERIANISM *vs.* THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

The discussion announced on the cover of our last number under this caption commenced on the 1st of August, and continued until the 5th. The assembly was estimated at upwards of a thousand people, chiefly from the neighboring country. This number diminished during the last three days in consequence of rainy weather; though even under this unfavorable circumstance, the congregations were always good and singularly attentive. It is the judgment of the brethren who heard it, that the debate will do good—and that the truth has suffered nothing at our hands. It is our opinion that Protestant sectarianism has received a blow in the country of the Meherrins from which it will not speedily recover. We believe that it cannot be extended; nor do we think that Presbyterianism and its allies can maintain their ground. We have assurances from many hearers that many prejudices have been removed, and that the sufficiency of the scriptures to make wise to eternal salvation has been amply sustained.

Among the subjects treated of were the demerits of Presbyterianism; the ability or inability of men to obey God; the work of the Holy Spirit; the Platonic doctrine of an immortal soul; the Fall of Man; the Conditionality of Eternal Life; Phrenology the true philosophy of Mind, &c.

We have been requested to publish the debate by several brethren and friends who were present. To this we have acceded, provided sufficient subscribers be obtained to defray the expense. We committed the substance of our opponent's speeches to writing; but that he might have no cause of complaint, we forwarded to him the proposition contained in the following note:—

Digitized by Google

"Mr. Thomas' compliments to Mr. Watt, and will thank him to forward the manuscript of his speeches to him through Mr. Watts of Wattsborough, who will convey them to Mr. T. when they meet on Saturday before the fourth Sunday of this month. If Mr. W. decline, Mr. T. will feel himself at liberty to proceed with the publication of the debate—giving the substance of Mr. W's speeches."

"August 7th, 1837."

We extract the following from a letter just come to hand from a much esteemed correspondent in the South, in relation to some of the topics before mentioned:—"I now beg that you collect and collate all your defence on that subject, as materials for your next Extra. It is desired by more than myself. I will take 50 additional copies. Do comply.—Let us show the world that we are not to be abashed on any ecclesiastical dogma when God speaks for us."———

In reply to this, we would say, that the debate which we are proposing to publish, will contain the pith and marrow of the whole matter.

To the debate will be annexed the address delivered on the Lord's day immediately after the discussion. The entire volume will not exceed *One Dollar*. The following gentlemen are respectfully requested to receive the names of responsible subscribers in their immediate circles:—Mr. J. Ragsdale, Mr. J. Boswell, Col. Richardson; brethren Stone, Lester, and Watts. They can give in their lists to Mr. Gil W. Watts of Wattsborough, who will forward them to me. Our agents and friends generally will perhaps act for us in this particular for the accommodation of our readers at large.

As less than *five dollars* cannot be transmitted by mail, *five copies* at least should be the subject of one order. Postage at the expense of the subscriber. EDITOR.

From the Virginia and North Carolina Conference Journal.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Dear brother Smith,

You will confer a favor by inserting the following in the columns of your valuable journal. A public discussion commenced the first day of this month, and terminated on the fifth day. The debate was held at the Fork Church, in Lunenburg, Virginia. The disputants were Mr. Watt, a minister of the Presbyterian denomination, on the one part, and Dr. John Thomas, formerly a follower of Mr. A. Campbell, on the other part.—Subject discussed—Has man an immortal soul, which can or does exist separate, distinct, and independently of the body? The affirmative of this question was assumed, and logically and scripturally defended by the Rev. Mr. Watt. Dr. Thomas made an effort to prove and demonstrate from the Holy Scriptures that man has no immortal soul within him; whether he demonstrated as clearly as a sun-beam that man has no immortal soul, I leave to the candid and intelligent hearer to decide. The discussion was opened by the Rev. Mr. Watt, by offering a concise prayer in the presence of all the people. It is due to Dr. Thomas to state, that he observed to the congregation, that if Mr. Watt or his friends wished to sing or pray, they could do so, but he should take no part in it. It was thought antecedent to the discussion, that several of the cardinal doctrines of our holy religion would have been discussed; but they were, for the most part, passed over. The immateriality, or immortality of the soul, was the principal topic of debate. Mr. Watt preached an hour in the commencement, in answer to a lecture which he had heard Dr. Thomas deliver some time previous to the discussion. Dr. Thomas thought that Mr. Watt did not do justice to his text; and after offering an apology to the audience for preaching, he observed that he would preach Mr. Watt's sermon for him; and from the attempt, I should say that I thought it must have been amongst his first efforts. But as he has such a natural aversion to text-preaching and sermonizing, I think he performed right down well. They continued speaking alternately for five days, at which time the debate closed. I might name many things, but as Dr. Thomas says he is going to publish the debate, I

Digitized by Google

think it unbecoming to particularize at full length. It might not be out of the way, however, to observe that Dr. Thomas does not think the thief who expired on the cross with Christ is either alive or in heaven. Paradise, says he, is a Persian word, which signifies a garden of delights. Abraham is not in heaven. Moses is not in heaven; but he confesses that there is some little mysticism involved in the case of Moses; for although Moses died and was buried, we are informed that he was one of those who held a colloquial intercourse with our blessed Redeemer at his transfiguration. Mysteries they pass over, when they casually blockade their luminous path; for it is a notorious fact, that mysteries, with the adherents of this system, are almost as rare occurrences as living men destitute of immortal souls. Dr. Thomas was very careful to inform us that he was baptizing a Methodist when he received the intelligence of the anticipated discussion. And is it a fact that Dr. Thomas convinced a Methodist that he has no immortal soul within him?—This champion of the non-immortality of the soul may succeed in getting other Methodists, and I hope he will winnow all from amongst us who have no souls; for he must remember that we have no employment for men in our church who have no souls. All that we can do is to shroud and inter them; this we consider our duty, according to the established laws of nature. If Dr. T. can retain them in his church, destitute of souls, we have not the least objection. He saves us the trouble of burying them—that is all. Dr. T. observed in his last speech that he had been listening during the debate to hear some arguments from his opponent, but he had not heard one single argument from him. If the Rev. Mr. Watt did not succeed in producing conviction upon the mind of Dr. Thomas, by logical argument, that man has an immortal soul within him, we think that he succeeded very happily in proving to Dr. Thomas, from an English Hebrew Lexicon, that the Hebrew word *nepheŝh* (which signifies soul) cannot mean a "smelling bottle." I think it due the church, and the community generally, to state, in a concise manner, some of the peculiar views of this man:—

1st. If Adam had eaten of the fruit of the tree of life, after his expulsion from Paradise, he would have lived forever in a state of mortality, which state of existence would have been infinitely worse than eternal destruction or annihilation.

2d. All infants, idiots, and heathens will sleep through endless duration—they never can rise.

3d. All Methodists, old side Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and sinners, will be raised to the damnation of annihilation.

4th. False religions, or the orthodox systems of the day, cannot exist independently of infants—their priests must have infants, by which they excite the sympathies of the ladies—through them they gain the influence of their husbands—the purse next in order—and thus it is that the credulous are imposed upon, and the people priest-ridden.

5th. Adults believe that their infant or baby-sprinkling will save them from hell, (by which I understand the Protestant or orthodox place of punishment.)

6th. What glory can redound to God from the simple fact or circumstance of heaven being filled with babies or infants, *volens vel nolens*.

7th. Eternal life or existence conditional, the condition being faith in the resurrection of Christ from the dead, reformation and baptism, (according to and baptisma, I suppose.) This proven from 1 Cor. xv. Acts iii.

8th. Man has no soul nor existence separate, distinct, and independently of the body.—Dr. Thomas observed that he felt encouraged to go forward in the way of truth, because, he remarked, I have succeeded in convincing many in this congregation from scripture and reason, that they have no immortal souls within them.

9th. That the Spirit of God does not operate on any person apart from the word written.

10th. It is sinful for unconverted persons to pray to God.

11th. Christ will reign in person upon the earth a thousand years, the seat of government being at Jerusalem.

The above are a few of the many heterodox, anti-scriptural, and infidel peculiarities and illogical absurdities of Dr. Thomas. And the paradox of paradoxes, and the enigma

Digitized by Google

of enigmas is, that this man, after all these absurdities, should profess to be an implicit believer in the scriptures of divine truth. This is indeed something new under the sun, at least to me. If the visionary speculations of Dr. Thomas be correct, then all others are wrong; for things absolutely different in their nature cannot be the same. If he is right, the Bible must be wrong; if he be right, the Bible is false production, which can be proven. Then a subversion of our holy religion takes place, and man at once becomes the pitiful dupe of all the chimerical speculations of the ambitious, designing sophist. The scriptures of divine truth which have come to us from the hands of a wise and unerring God, professing to have been written by the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, do not, nay, cannot teach doctrines so diametrically opposite in their nature. I am aware that many ontologists have ransacked the mystical depths of metaphysics in search of arguments to establish the sceptical and atheistical hypothesis that man is "but organized dust;" but never, until last week, did I believe that any man, possessing the slightest faith in God's revelation to man, would stand up in the presence of listening hundreds, and attempt to prove from the scriptures that man is but a polished ape. My advice to all is to shun infidels, and read the Bible. In the above I have done no injustice to Dr. Thomas.

JAS. W. HUNNICUTT.

Richmond, August 10, 1837.

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING DOCUMENTS.

On the documents above presented, we cannot, with a due regard to all our responsibilities, do less than propose to our brethren the following questions:—

Do they approve and fellowship these new doctrines, and view themselves as all body—as souless, spiritless, and animal as the beasts that perish; only of a finer dust or more ingenious organization than they? If they do, I pray them to strike me from their list of *men*.

But if they do not, then I ask them, Can they, on their allegiance to their Lord, or with a due regard to self-respect, recognize and sustain as their brother in the Lord, the person who propagates such views of him and them?

Do they regard as worthy of their communion him who denies the resurrection of the dead, and the future judgment of all mankind? Or do they hold these as matters of opinion, and not of faith?

Is he their "*apostolic advocate*" who preaches, writes, and publicly debates to convince them and the world of this doleful gospel—THAT ALL ADAM'S RACE WHO DIE IN INFANCY ARE LOST FOR EVER?

Or will they retain in their communion a *factionist* of the most decided character, whose devotion to his own opinions is only surpassed by his unblushing hardihood of assertion in defending them?

Or will they superadd to the gospel facts, and hitch to the car of Reformation the new and untaught questions of reformed Sadduceeism?

Have they resolved to have the press which they support devoted to the discussion of such questions as have been served up to them for the last two years by this bold speculator?

Digitized by Google

And, finally, have they resolved that this new and improved system of Materialism shall, at their expense, be printed and debated before the public, and in every form palmed upon the community, while we silently look on and register its progress?

These are questions which, in my judgment, most solemnly call for their gravest consideration and immediate action. For myself I can only speak, and I owe it to the community at large to say, that I can have no more fellowship with these pernicious doctrines, nor with those who believe and teach them, than I can have with Mormonism and those who teach it. I regard the author of them as an incorrigible factionist, and the new doctrines as now avowed positively subversive of the Christian faith. No sincerity in the adoption of these opinions, no honesty or conscientiousness in the avowal of them, can divest them of their scepticism, or the author of them of the character of a factionist or schismatic.

It is with great reluctance that I thus express myself, aware as I am of the easy perversion and misapplication of these expressions. I sympathize with many of our brethren, who, through the fear of the reproach of "Campbellism," would rather appear to dissent from me than to be governed by my views or my advice. Yet I need as much of their sympathy as they do of mine, because, while discharging a duty which I owe them and my Master, I am hazarding that which is as painful to my feelings, viz.—the appearance of dictating to, or assuming any authority over my brethren, as the charge of "Campbellism" is to them. This opprobrious designation has, I fear, usurped a sinister influence both upon my brethren and myself. I have hesitated to speak out in proper season, and refrained from giving my advice, lest I should appear to dictate; and some of my brethren, *I suspect*, in some cases have rather boasted a little in differing from my views and conclusions, as a proof of their not being led by any person. Thus, between this commendable delicacy, or, as others might regard it, morbid sensibility on both sides, Satan is likely to carry his point and baffle our course as though the calumny feared were ever so well founded. For if he turn away the ears of the unconverted from the gospel, and the disciples from doing their duty through the fear of the reproach of "Campbellism," then indeed he has succeeded as well by this name as by persecution or any other means which in former times he has had ingenuity to employ.

But the present crisis elevates me above all this squeamishness; and although a perverse genius may easily misrepresent my interference, the call upon me is too imperious to be disregarded; and be the consequences what they may to myself, I hazard them rather than silently to

Digitized by Google

permit the truth to be perverted and the cause of reformation to be disgraced by winking at the propagation of doctrines which have since the days of the ancient Sadducees till now, been repudiated by the wise and good.

There is also in this case a peculiar delicacy arising from another consideration. Dr. Thomas and myself, though not formally, have really been in a sort of controversy about some of these new doctrines—not, however, so distinctly avowed as they now are; and my fear is, that the attitude in which I now present myself to him and his views may be regarded by some as rather of a vindictive character. I can only sincerely say, that no such feelings actuate me. I have, from excessive delicacy of feeling and tenderness in his case, while there was the least hope of reclaiming him from his opinionism, rather parried than sought discussion. True, on one point I descanted upon one of his dogmas in good earnest, but, it seems, with little good effect; for although I plead before his face insuperable facts to his theory, some of which he did not even profess to meet or obviate; yet, as pertinacious as ever, he re-assumes and re-asserts, as if his sincerity and confident manner were proofs as strong as holy writ. Becoming excessively vulgar, and as I thought abusive, I declined any farther notice of him, and bade him some months since a benevolent adieu; with some faint hope that in this way he might be induced to reconsider his course and take up something more practical and useful than these idle and heretical speculations.

But this has only, it appears, whetted his appetite for controversy; for, by some singular fatality, he seems always to misinterpret my treatment of his case. He takes it for granted that he is so plausible, so argumentative, so powerful, so irresistible, that he has become a very formidable antagonist; and that cowardice, rather than benevolence or pity, has influenced my conduct towards him. If I thought that a repetition of my former declarations, or a candid and conscientious avowal of my estimate of his argumentative powers would be of any service to him, I would not withhold them: but were I to state that I do most sincerely regard him as a mere sophist, too weak and hazardous, too glaring and mutable ever to form and cement a party, it would avail nothing; and therefore, believing him to "be subverted" from the faith by false reasonings and "science falsely so called," and going about to subvert others; and therefore coming under the precept of Paul, (Titus iii. 10.) I have no farther object in these remarks than to give my reasons why I can no longer regard him as a brother in the Lord.

It therefore belongs to the church of which he is a member to consider whether his case is not of the same *genus* with that of Hymeneus and

Digitized by Google

Philetus, (2 Tim. ii. 16, 17.) and then for sister churches to act upon their approbation or disapprobation of her decision of this question.—*The Rubicon is passed* in the late discussion, as is evident from the report of Dr. Thomas and the Methodist Journal above quoted. If the whole of his procedure in defence of those positions which subvert the faith of the resurrection of the dead and of *eternal* and *universal* judgment, and his untiring pertinacity to propagate them, do not make out as clear a case of a factionist, or heretic, as defined by Paul, I would despair of ever finding an unequivocal case in the present day.

I will only add, that in a case of this sort, an explicit renunciation of these nine doctrines, not merely a promise to suppress them or to hold them as private property, as though they were inoperative opinions, would be indispensable to Christian communion.

As this is a new and important case of discipline amongst our brethren, it behooves them to act with understanding and decision. May the Lord give them understanding in this crisis!

A. C.

Steam Boat Coquette, Ohio River, Sept. 28, 1837.

Discussion of Universalism.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

No. X.

UTICA, N. Y. September 22, 1837.

MY DEAR SIR—Yours of the 22d ult. has just arrived. I hasten to reply.

2—I had fondly flattered myself, that how much soever you might be inclined to exercise your ingenuity and tact in evading or attempting to invalidate the force of my reasoning and arguments, that the game of palpable sophism, open perversion, and downright distortion of my language and meaning, had been given up, and would not again be attempted by you—that if not the gravity and dignity of the Christian minister, at least the decorum and affability of the gentleman, would have been maintained. Not only our professions, and the position we occupy before the public, but the solemnity of the theme under discussion, and the deep and thrilling importance of the subject, should demand candor, honesty, and Christian fairness between us. It has been a source of deep regret to me, and I know it has also to the readers of both our papers, that there has been too little of the open, fair, and generous spirit of the gospel in this discussion thus far; and I am sorry to see that the letter now before me makes apparently no nearer approximation to this spirit.

3—In your 3d and 4th paragraphs you demand why *aion* should

Digitized by Google

mean *endless* when applied to happiness, and *ending* when applied to punishment, and repeat the question in various forms, as though I had given those definitions of *aion*. But this you knew that I had never done. Because I deny that *aion*, when applied to punishment, means *endless*, does this prove that I give *ending* as its definition? Because I say of a *great* man, he is not *infinitely* great, does this convict me of saying he is a *little* man? But worse than this: in your 11th paragraph you accuse me and my system of "attempts to expel from the universe 'that horrid system,' as you [I] call it, that God will punish sin!" Have I ever denied—have I not uniformly maintained—and does not the very proposition under discussion, necessarily suppose that God will punish sin? Is this, my dear sir, Christian candor and fairness on your part? I do fervently hope in future communications to have no further occasion to notice these things.

4—Your letter now before me, although it contains some arguments, does not, in my opinion, answer that part of my first letter relating to the subject, nor meet the merits of the question at issue, and for the following reasons:—1. You undertake to show that *aion* must mean naturally and primarily *endless duration* from its *radical derivation*, without any attempt at proof, and I think without any possibility of proving, that either *radix*, or root, from which it is derived, is ever used in the New Testament to signify endless duration. 2. You assume or take for granted, that *aionios*, when applied to *life* in the New Testament, uniformly, or very generally, signifies *endless*, which is not conceded, nor do I think it can be proved. 3. You assume without argument, and assert without proof, that the five passages you quote where *aionios* is applied to punishment, destruction, condemnation, &c. all relate "to the *future state of wicked men*," and mean "*endless* punishment, *endless* destruction," &c.; whereas you have a great labor to perform before you will be able to make that appear. 4. You have made no effort to prove from the *nature of punishment itself*, that it is, or necessarily must be endless; but this must be done before so ambiguous a word as *aionios* can be allowed any force towards establishing its endless duration. But this I am confident you will not be able to do till your locks are greyer than I suppose them to be at present.

5—I will now go into an examination of the radical derivation and meaning of *aion* and *aionios*. For I deem it useless to spend time about the Hebrew *olem*, it being by both of us conceded that it is the exact synonyme (at least scripturally) of these two Greek words. You maintain that *aion* is the only word in the Greek Testament which expresses simple duration without end. If this be correct, I am confident that simple duration without end is not expressed in the New Testament. Your reason is, that it is derived from *aei*, *always*, and *oon*, *being* or *existing—always existing*.

6—Now as *oon* is nothing more nor less than the present participle *being*, from *eimi*, *to be*, it follows of course, that *duration of being* is not expressed by this root of *aion*, and therefore, whatever force the whole word may have in expressing duration, must be derived entirely from the adverb *aei*, which we translate by *always*. An examination of all the passages in the New Testament, where *aei* occurs, will be the best criterion by which to judge of the meaning of this root of *aion*. It occurs eight times, as follows:—

Digitized by Google

7—Mark xvi. 8—"And the multitude, crying aloud, began to desire him to do as he had *aei* (*ever*) done unto them:" i. e. *uniformly* since he (Pilate) had been governor. Acts vii. 51—"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do *aei* (*always*) resist the Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do ye:" i. e. ye do *continually*, *habitually*, resist, &c. 2 Cor. iv. 11—"For we which live are *aei* (*always*) delivered unto death," &c. i. e. *constantly*, *at all times*, liable to death. 2 Cor. vi. 10—"As sorrowful, yet *aei* (*always*) rejoicing;" i. e. *continually*. Titus i. 12—"The Cretans are *aei* (*always*) liars:" i. e. *habitually*. Heb. iii. 10—"They do *aei* (*always*) err in their hearts:" i. e. *uniformly*, *habitually*. 1 Peter iii. 14—"Be ready *aei* (*always*) to give an answer to every man," &c i. e. *at all times*, *continually*. 2 Peter i. 12—"Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you *aei* (*always*) in remembrance of these things:" i. e. *constantly*. These are all the places where *aei* occurs in the New Testament, and in not one of them does the word signify *endlessly*, or apply to any period beyond this state of being. And if neither of the two roots signifies *endlessly*, it is useless to attempt to prove that *aion* has the radical meaning of *endless duration*. Judging from its *riddix*, we should conclude the word was used to express, not *endless being*, as you suppose, but *continuity*, or *continuous being*, without any *necessary* reference to duration: and such is really the fact concerning it.

8—By an examination which I have just made of the Greek Testament, I find *aion*, the substantive, thus formed from *aei* and *oon*, occurs *one hundred and twenty-seven times*, (instead of only *one hundred and three times*, as you have it.) It is rendered *ever*, seventy-one times; *never*, seven times; *world*, thirty-six times; *worlds*, twice; *evermore*, three times; *ages*, twice; *eternal*, twice; *world without end*, once; *course*, once; and left untranslated twice. It occurs in the *singular number sixty-five times*, and in the *plural sixty-two times* It is never translated *eternity* in the New Testament, and in most cases would make nonsense if it were.

9—Suppose we try a few instances. Col. i. 26—"The mystery which hath been hid from the *eternities (ainon)* and from generations," &c. Eph. ii. 7—"That in the *eternities (aioso)* to come, he might show," &c. Eph. iii. 11—"According to the purpose of the *eternities (ainon,)* &c. Eph. ii. 2—"According to the *eternity (aiona)* of this world." Matt. xii. 32—"Neither in this *eternity (aioni)* nor the coming." xiii. 22—"And the cares of this *eternity (aionos,)*" &c. Verses 39, 40—"The harvest is the end of this *eternity* (*aionos;*) so will it be in the end of this *eternity* (*aionos.*") Rom. xii. 2—"And be not conformed to this *eternity* [*aioni.*"] 1 Cor. ii. 6—"We speak—not the wisdom of this *eternity* [*aionos,*] nor of the princes of this *eternity* [*aionos.*"] 2 Tim. iv. 18—"To whom be glory to the *eternities* of *eternities* [*tous aionas ton aionon.*"] This form of the *double plural*, or plural twice repeated, occurs twenty-one times, and is used as the most intensive form of the word, and is a circumstance sufficient to prove that the word does not of itself radically, legitimately, or properly imply endless duration. A *proper eternity* is *one*, undivided, indivisible, unbeginning, unending, and can have no PARTS. The translators of the common version evidently paid very little attention either to the number [whether singular or plural] or to the form of the word, [whether sub-

Digitized by Google

stantive or adjective,] as they frequently *change the number*, and also render the *substantive by an adjective*, and the *adjective by a substantive*. But could they do this with a word radically signifying *eternity!*

10—The adjective *aionios*, formed from *aion*, occurs in the New Testament, according to my enumeration, (and my enumeration agrees with Scarlett,) only *seventy-one times*, (instead of seventy-five, as you have it,) and is rendered *eternal*, forty-two times; *everlasting*, twenty-five times; *ever*, once; and *world*, three times, (though you say, paragraph 19, it is rendered by no other word than *eternal*, *everlasting*, and *forever*.) It is applied to *zoe*, *life*, *forty-four times*; *thrice* to fire; *thrice* to times; (*chronon aionon*;) *thrice* to glory, and *once* each to punishment, destruction, condemnation, judgment, things unseen, house, salvation, redemption, spirit, inheritance, him, [meaning Onesimus,] habitation, God, consolation, power, weight, covenant, kingdom, and gospel.

11—In Scarlett's translation of the New Testament, the adjective *aionion* is retained, or rendered *æonion*. The reason he gives for this, is, "Because there is no word in the English language which fully expresses what that word in its original sense implies. Had it been lawful to have coined a new word to express *aionion* in English, perhaps *agical*, or *age-lasting*, would have been near it." In further remarking on *aionios*, he says, "The word expresses duration, or continuance; but it is sometimes of a short and sometimes of a longer duration. Paul, writing to Philemon concerning Onesimus, says, 'Perhaps he was separated for a while that thou mightest have him *æonianly*'—This certainly could mean only during the life of Onesimus. So also Jude (7) says, 'Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed, and set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *æonian fire*.' Though this fire lasted upwards of 2000 years," [or from the time of Abraham to the days of Philo Judæus, in the beginning of the second century,] it is now extinct.

12—"But," continues Scarlett, "that AIONION does not mean ENDLESS or ETERNAL, may appear from considering that no adjective can have a greater force than the substantive from which it is derived: thus BLACK cannot mean more than BLACKNESS; WHITE cannot mean more than WHITENESS—if AION means AGE, and its plural AGES, (which none either will or can deny,) then AIONION must mean AGE-LASTING, or duration to the AGE or AGES to which the thing spoken of relates. That this is the meaning of the word in the Septuagint, will not be disputed by any one that recollects the EVERLASTING covenant of circumcision, (Genesis xvii. 13;) the EVERLASTING covenant of Priesthood, (Numb. xxv. 13;) the EVERLASTING statute of the day of atonement, (Lev. xvi. 34,) &c. &c. The AIONION covenants, statutes, &c. are waxed old and have vanished away. When the reader meets with the phrase ÆONIAN GOD, he will understand thereby that God reigns through all the ÆONS or AGES, whether past, present, or to come, and ÆONIAN SPIRIT is the SPIRIT OF GOD, which has presided over the church in all AGES or ÆONS."

13—"ÆONIAN LIFE, in the largest view of it, is the life which GOD HATH GIVEN US IN CHRIST, ACCORDING AS HE HATH CHOSEN US IN HIM BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, (Eph. i. 4; 1 John v. 11,) or the life which is conveyed from Christ to all the sons of men in the course of the AGES of his reign. (Rom. v. 21; iv. 23.) But in its more

Digitized by Google

confined sense, ÆONIAN LIFE is the life of the believer in the present, or MILLENNIAL AGE, which is the peculiar portion of God's first-born or church, and which they alone enjoy." (John v. 24; xvii. 3; Matt. xxv. 46.) "ÆONIAN JUDGMENT, Heb. vi. 3, the Editor [Scarlett] thinks is the judgment of the Aaronic ÆON, or AGE, which is past, under which the priests gave judgment according to the law. (Lev. xiii. 13; Numb. v. 15, 16; Exodus xxviii. 30.) ÆONIAN GOSPEL, is the good news of reconciliation to God, through Christ; which will continue to be preached through the ÆONS, until every creature, whether in heaven or earth, visible or invisible, is reconciled to God. (Col. i. 16—21.) And then the promulgation of the gospel will cease. As there was a period when the ÆONS began, so a period will come when they will all have an end."

14—The AIONIOS ZOE (eternal, or everlasting life") of the gospel, almost always, if not uniformly, signifies the CONTINUOUS SPIRITUAL LIFE or JOY and PEACE which believers enjoy, which pertains peculiarly to Messiah's kingdom. In not one instance in all the New Testament, does the phrase necessarily, unequivocally, and exclusively apply to the immortal and endless state of glory hereafter. So much for your "loftiest of all adjectives."

15—From the foregoing facts and authority it clearly appears that AION, and AIONIOS, neither RADICALLY, (or by the roots,) nor naturally, by their construction, nor scripturally, nor commonly, by their usage, signify ENDLESS DURATION. That although in their secondary, or accommodated, or as you would call it, their FIGURATIVE SENSE, they MAY be applied to subjects that are endless, and so signify endless when thus applied; yet whenever this is the case, the subject necessarily fixes this modification of meaning to the words, and not they to the subject. That when applied to life itself, they do not signify endless duration, much less then can they signify ENDLESS when applied to punishment, destruction, condemnation, judgment, or fire, the only words you can find them connected with where you even pretend that punishment is spoken of.

16—You ask why these words should not mean duration without end, when applied to punishment? This question, sir, is not for me to answer. The affirmative of the proposition is yours. And as you ask why they should not, I ask why they *should?* Can you assign any reason? Is there any thing in the NATURE of punishment which necessarily supposes it will be endless? What is punishment—an end? or a means? If it be an end, it was DESIGNED by the Creator of man when he gave existence to our race; and will you seek to thwart the END JEHOVAH HAS IN VIEW? Is endless damnation, then, the chief end of man—the end for which our race, or any portion thereof, was created? You will not, you dare not affirm it. It would be a libel on the character of God, transforming him into a worse than fiend. If punishment be not an end, but a means to an end, then it cannot, from its very nature, be endless; it could never accomplish the end which as a means it was designed to accomplish. The laboring oar, sir, is in your hand—prove that PUNISHMENT OR MISERY IS NECESSARILY or from its NATURE and DESIGN, ENDLESS, and I yield. But as yet you have made no effort to prove this, or even to prove that the passages of scripture you cite, where AIONION is connected with punishment, &c. have any reference whatever to a future state of being.

Digitized by Google

17—A few passing remarks on some of your paragraphs, and I close. You seem to desire information towards the close of your 3d paragraph, whether the adjective gives to, or derives from, the substantive its meaning. Answer: In some cases both have a bearing in modifying the meaning of each other—e. g. we speak of a WISE MAN and the WISE GOD—a GOOD MAN and the GOOD GOD. We understand the words WISE and GOOD in a finite or limited sense when applied to man, but in an infinite or unlimited sense when applied to God: and yet we not understand either a *foolish* man, or a *foolish* God; a *bad* man, or a *bad* God. AIONIOS in construction with a substantive, is to be understood in a similar way as *wise* and *good* in the above instances. Your 5th paragraph. As I have not been, so I do not design to be, "either flattered or provoked" to do the business that properly belongs to you. If you add to the testimony as you have in your 6th paragraph, where you speak of ENDLESS PUNISHMENT, ENDLESS DESTRUCTION, ENDLESS DAMNATION, &c. as though these were already proved, THREE will not only become NINE, but very soon NINETY-NINE, in your hands. You need not fear treading on my toes. (See your 10th paragraph.) If you will only keep your feet off of divine truth, and forbear to tread the testimony of scripture and candor under foot, I will not complain. Universalists have no "rancor" against the adjective AIONIOS. It is perfectly harmless to us; and we are confident that long after the merciless dogma of endless misery, which is now clinging to AIONION as its last plank of hope, shall have sunk into the ocean of oblivion, the plank itself shall triumphantly ride above the ocean for *many a happy age*.

18—Accept my thanks, kind sir, that you have not opened the vials of your "vengeance" upon me for my "irony or satire or criticism." (See your 12th paragraph.) Such lenity is worthy of all commendation. From your 13th to your 18th paragraph, inclusive, you labor very assiduously to show that I have subtlely changed the question in debate, and imposed on myself and the community, by assuming that what is true of a state in the abstract, is true of each individual belonging to that state in the concrete. I deny the justice of this charge. I have used no subtlety nor sophistry at all. I have simply stated the honest convictions of my heart, and what I deemed fair conclusive reasoning and scriptural argument in the case; and refer our readers again to my first letter for re-examination. Does not the great and infallible Teacher declare, that "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection"? Does not Paul declare that "all shall be made alive in Christ," and then tell in WHAT MANNER they shall be raised, viz. in INCORRUPTION, GLORY, POWER, and SPIRITUALITY? Will you say, sir, that what is true of one is not true of all in that glorious state? Or will you say that any that are raised to incorruption, glory, power, and spirituality, and are the children of God, equal unto the angels, and can die no more, will nevertheless be miserable? Will you deny that all such will be PERFECTLY HAPPY, and ENDLESSLY HAPPY? If so, then settle your account with the Bible, and not with me.

19—In your 10th and 17th paragraphs, you have (probably undesignedly) conceded two important facts, viz. that "immortal, incorruptible,

Digitized by Google

indissoluble, &c. denote two or more ideas;" of course, then, they are altogether more copious in their meaning than *aion* or its derivative *aionios* can be, yourself being judge: and also that there is in all these words an idea of *duration*, which, in your reply to Mr. Montgomery you were seemingly fain to deny.

20—What you say from your 19 h to your 23d paragraph, inclusive, more properly belongs to the third proposition than to the second. One question is enough at a time. I will, therefore, only remark concerning your 19th and 20th paragraphs, that my own authorities would not give as the definition of *akatalutos*, or *aptharsia*, any word so ambiguous or indefinite as *eternal* or *everlasting*. The same reason might be offered why *eternal* is the last word employed to define *aphthartos*. I am alike indifferent to your affected sneers and ridicule, and your kindly proffered advice in your 22d paragraph. Why do you infer, paragraph 23, that Paul considered *apthartos*, 1 Tim. i. 17, *subordinate* to aionios? Why, forsooth, because he places *aionios before apthartos in that verse!* Verily, this is a most singular reason. But, sir, how do you know but what Paul began with the lowest epithet and rose to the *climax*, increasing in sublimity as he advanced? If your reasoning be correct, then Paul must have considered *invisibleness* a quality of the Divine Being, altogether more important than *wisdom;* for after calling him the "eternal and immortal," he calls him "the *invisible* and *only wise* God!" This "shows that in his critical skill," *wise* differs from *invisible* "most subordinately!" I suppose, however, that the Apostle threw in these terms just as they happened to come into his mind, without reference to the greater or lesser importance of the adjectives.

21—All the great authorities lying around you in such profusion—*translators, lexicographers, et cetera*, who have given "*eternal* or *everlasting* as the first and most natural, literal, and obvious meaning of *aionios*," have, in my opinion, thereby evinced their wisdom, and shown that they could render it by a word nearly, though not quite, as ambiguous in the English Bible as *aionios* was in the Greek. Had they rendered it by the word *endless* instead of *eternal* or *everlasting*, I should have thought them all wiseacres indeed. The unsupported assertions of your 25th paragraph, are of a piece with much that you have before written. However, as you say in it, you have "only *introduced* the matter," I fondly cherish the hope that your future assertions will be accompanied with a corresponding weight of evidence.

22—You will oblige me by sending the proof or copy of your next to Richmond, Va., whither I expect to go to spend the winter, ere your next will have time to reach me here.

I am truly and most respectfully you friend,

D. SKINNER.

MR. CAMPBELL TO MR. SKINNER.

No. XI.

Steam-Boat Coquette, Ohio River, Sept. 30, 1837.

Of one of the Cesars it has been truly said, that he sought the fame of victory and the spoils of war more than the good of his country or of human kind. If, like him, you are not too much enamored with the love of glory, you do yourself great injustice. We have not yet discussed the first proposition, and already you have proclaimed about

Digitized by Google

seven triumphs. Our readers will, I fear, begin to think that you are more in quest of victory than of truth. Dazzled with the splendor of your conquests as with their number, you excel even Cesar in the relation of them. Three words told his glory—two yours. He said, VENI, VIDI, VICI, (I came, I saw, I conquered.) But you still more heroically say, VIDI, VICI, (I saw, I conquered.) It is your glory, sir, to gain a triumph before you enter the field of battle. I know indeed some cynical folks may say that you resemble not so much the Roman hero, as a certain American chief, who, while he was on the retreat, was always reporting the victories he had gained.

2—Connate with this your gasconade, as some hypercritics might call it, are the elegancies of the following Universalian compliments. Of yourself and me in contrast you very politely say, "I studiously avoid all ambiguity; a thing, by the bye, of which I fear you will never be guilty, so long as a DOUBLE ENTENDRE will serve your purpose better"—"You well knew that certain words would answer for you to play an ambiguous game with"—"Keep cool, friend Campbell—keep cool: you will not only *feel* but *do* much better;" and why did you not add, 'Don't swear, don't lie, friend Campbell!'—"I will not waste my spittle to quench your sun till it rises"—"I hope my dear friend will get in better humor before he writes again," &c. &c. &c.

3—These, sir, are a few, a sample of your Universalian nosegays from your letter No. X. My readers will remember, as an excuse for me, that you were recommended to me as a most GENTLEMANLY opponent—not only as the MAGNUS APOLLO, but also as the BEAU IDEAL of an honorable Universalist disputant. They will therefore forgive me, and I will endeavor to give them a specimen of self-government.

4—Notwithstanding your seven triumphs, I am gratified to observe in your letter of August, No. X., received while I was (as I am now) from home, that my syllogistic parallelisms between the various acceptations of Paradise, Heaven, Hell, Shemim, and Gehenna, have been by you unequivocally admitted. For this admission you may have as many triumphs as you make paragraphs in your reply to this. The concession is, that although Shemim, Paradise, Heaven, Hell, Gehenna, all originally meant something earthly, local, and passing away, they have actually become the figures of other states, and the names of them too, and that they *might* even represent a future state of misery or bliss. This is all I asked. But, strange to tell, now that I have sustained my first proposition, it is not one of the arguments of Universalists; that, in one word, "Universalists do not now argue that because Gehenna originally meant the Valley of Hinnom, therefore it cannot represent a state of punishment after death." And what in the name of reason, mean the hundred volumes of Universalists, proving that Gehenna originally meant the Valley of Hinnom, if they did not thence argue that it could not in the New Testament mean a state of future and endless punishment? or that it could not depart so far from its original meaning! And why do you dwell so much upon the original meaning of this word!!

5—Our readers will judge between us here when I have quoted a few words from your oracle Mr. Balfour:—"I have," says he, "contended that the Jews could not understand our Lord by 'the damnation of hell' to mean a place of eternal misery, because Gehenna had no such

Digitized by Google

meaning in the Old Testament."* Again, to sustain himself on this ground, he says, "The Old Testament is the dictionary of the language of the New;" and therefore whatever Gehenna meant in the Old it must mean in the New Testament. And yet you now affirm that Universalists never denied that Gehenna might mean endless punishment, so far as its original signification is concerned!!

6—And why do you, par. 5 and 6, recall this concession, and again, for the tenth time, tell us that Gehenna originally meant the Valley of Hinnom; and ask, "What reason have we to suppose it was used in an entirely different sense in the New Testament?" But as you have admitted my syllogistic arguments, letter VIII, p. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, you cannot now be indulged with the re-occupancy of the fortress which you have abandoned, if not surrendered.

7—Yet I must say, that it is not an entirely different sense even from its Old Testament acceptation, yourself being judge: for you say, "In process of time"—yes, I quote your words, "*in process of time* Gehenna, and Tophet, another name for the same thing, were used in the Old Testament *figuratively* to set forth the temporal but severe judgments coming upon the Jews." In process of time it began to be used *figuratively!* Well, so far so good. And upon better testimony than your Balfour, we add, *in process of time* it was used to represent future and eternal punishment, as is found in the apocryphal books of the Old Testament and in the Jewish Targums. These writings, so far as the use of words or their current acceptation are concerned, are of as much authority as dictionaries. The *norma loquendi*, or the particular meaning of words in any given time, must be learned from the books of that time. Hence some of our most learned writers have been at pains to show that during the interim between Malachi and Matthew Levi, the word Gehenna was used figuratively to represent not only future punishment, but future punishment in another state of existence. The "*process* of time" and the process of change which you mention, may, even upon the concessions of Balfour, be continued on down to the New Testament.

8—In the New Testament, as I have already shown, (though you seem not to have noticed it,) this is not the only term which in process of time has come to mean something very different from its Old Testament or original meaning. Did I not enumerate the words Jerusalem, Mount Zion, Temple, Circumcision, Passover, Manna, Babylon, as well as Garden or Paradise, Heaven, Hell, &c.? And will you hazard the denial that these words have meanings in the New Testament which they never had in the Old?

9—After all, your courage rises to concede, par. 7, still more unambiguously all that you seemed just above desirous to recall. "Therefore," you conclude, "I do not say that because Gehenna originally meant the Valley of Hinnom, it cannot represent a state of punishment after death in another world." Now, sir, stand to this. Let it be final, and tell us no more about the Valley of Hinnom.

10—But we are yet one step before you. We do not only say that in accordance with the laws of language and the words Paradise, Heaven, Temple, Zion, Jerusalem, Babylon, &c. &c., it *may mean*, but it does actually mean, in the New Testament, punishment after death.

* Balfour's Inquiry, p. 134, 179.

Digitized by Google

in another state of existence. And to present our proof in order—that Hell or Gehenna, in the Christian Scriptures represents a place or state of punishment after death, we argue:—

11—1st. From Matth. x. 28. where Christ taught his hearers to *fear him* that *after death*, "after he has killed the body," has power to destroy both soul and body in hell: FEAR HIM." Hell, then, indubitably denotes a state of future punishment after death.

12—2d. The Messiah again threatens *punishment in hell* to some of his contemporaries as unavoidable: "How can you escape the damnation of hell?" Matth. xxiii. 33.

13—3d. Jesus uses the words "*hell fire*," "unquenchable fire," "everlasting fire," as substitutes for hell, or as equivalent to one another. Matth. xviii. 8, 9. Mark ix. 43, 44, 45. Words, as well as things, that are equal to the same term, are equal to one another.

14—4th. *Hell* is by Jesus contrasted with *life;* and to "go into hell" opposed to "entering into life." But to "enter into life" is by Jesus explained as equivalent to *entering into heaven* or into eternal life after death. Therefore, to go into hell is the opposite of going into heaven. If heaven be everlasting bliss, hell is everlasting misery,

15—5th. But as the word Hell or Gehenna occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and as it is impossible to show that the Valley of Hinnŏm or any temporal punishment was ever intended by any of them, they may in their various occurrences be regarded as so many evidences of punishment after death in another state of existence.

16—Now we shall see what you have been able to urge against these proofs. With regard to the first it is said, Perhaps—the person who had power to cast into hell after death was some of the Roman Cesars—and the disciples of Christ and his hearers were commanded supremely to fear Cesar, because he had power to destroy both soul and body in the conflagration of Jerusalem! With regard to the second—Perhaps the "damnation of hell" meant the conflagration of Jerusalem, with all its calamities, by the hand of Titus; and perhaps some of the scribes and elders to whom Christ said, "How can you escape the punishment of hell," lived forty years after Christ—perhaps they were present in the siege, and perhaps they were burned in the Temple. In reference to the third—Perhaps the "everlasting fire" substituted for "hell" by Jesus, (Matth. & Mark,) meant the sparks of Hinnom or the transient flames of Jerusalem. And with regard to the fourth, to *enter into life* certainly means to join the church—and contrasts certainly do not mean contrasts, because a hot day (which may sometimes be 100 degrees above zero,) when contrasted with a cold day, does not mean 100 degrees below zero!!! This being your own logic, sir, I return it without any other comment than—Perhaps you may be mistaken in some one or all of these hypotheses against facts. We only affirm that a thousand such hypotheses would not disprove one fact.

17—But with regard to the fifth proof, you quote a note from my Family Testament, with a very triumphant air; and yet the said note on Matth. v. 22., does not prove for you any thing that in this controversy I have denied. For the note does not say more than that the judges, the council, and the hell fire *alluded* to in the passage were all *human punishments*, and were used by Christ as figures or illustrations of the severity of his administration as respected the discrimination and pun-

Digitized by Google

ishment of offences! I request our readers to examine the whole note. And this is all you have to except out of the New Testament use of the word as possibly once referring to your Valley of Hinnom!

18—But you will say you have made a stronger effort against my fourth proof. Well, we shall try it. To "enter into life" you now affirm does never mean to enter into heaven; and this is your proof, that it always means to join the church. Summary logic! In your letter, No. VII., par. 13, you do admit that sometimes "life, entering into life," &c. mean in scripture entering into future and eternal bliss. But in your last letter you recall this and affirm as follows:—"I have not admitted, and do not admit, that 'enter into life' is *ever* equivalent in scripture to entering into the immortal beatitude in the eternal world." p. 13. What credit is due this assertion will appear by comparing it with the passage above referred to. Your words are—"That life, entering into life, passing from death to life, entering into the kingdom of God, kingdom of heaven, &c. do not in the Scriptures GENERALLY signify future and eternal bliss or entering into immortal beatitude, I think must be obvious to the most superficial biblical critics." Now I ask every man of sense, whether the affirmation that a word *generally* does not mean entering into life, is not an admission that it *sometimes* does so mean? However, you now say it never does so signify. I will rest all the controversy on my proving that it does so signify according to the best interpreters in the universe.

19—In your letter No. X., p. 14, your words are—"In reply to your 14th, 15th, and 16th paragraphs, I remark, that the phrase 'enter into life' only occurs in three passages in the New Testament; viz. Matth. xviii. 8 & 9: xix. 17. and Mark ix. 43, 47: and in all the three passages evidently means entering into the gospel dispensation." And what is your proof? You say, "The only way of coming at the true meaning of the phrase is to collate all the places where it occurs, with their respective contexts, and compare them with other phrases as nearly resembling it as can be found." But you have not worked by your own rule. We shall try it. Let the reader open Matthew xix., and carefully read from the 16th verse to the end. The facts are:—

20—A rich man asks the Messiah what he should do "that he may have eternal life." Jesus replies, "If you would enter into life, keep the commandments." Observe first *to have eternal life* and *to enter into life* in the style of the Great Teacher are equivalent. The young man went off disobedient; upon which Jesus said, "A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God." This also is made equivalent with "entering into life" or "having eternal life." The disciples, startled at the answer given to the young worldling, ask, "What shall we have that have left all for your sake?" The answer, as stated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is, "A hundred fold more in the present life, and *in the world to come eternal life.*" Now I ask every unsophisticated mind, can there be any thing more plain than that Jesus used the words "*inherit eternal life*," "*enter into life*," "*enter into the kingdom of God*," and "*receive eternal life in the world to come*," as equivalent!! Compare Matth xix. 16—30. with Mark x. 17—30. and Luke xviii. 17—30. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all finish the same narrative in the same words—"He shall receive in the world to come *life everlasting*," as contrasted with all that he receives in the present life. Nothing, then, can

Digitized by Google

be more evident than that to "enter into life," to "inherit eternal life," to "enter into the kingdom of God," and to "receive in the world to come eternal life," are used by Jesus as perfectly equivalent.

21—I may, under another head of this controversy, enlarge much upon this subject. In the mean time I will only add, that although all Christians are said to have life, and to have eternal life abiding in them, as a *principle* and a *right*, or gift *under Christ;* yet the inheriting, entering into, or receiving life, or eternal life, is always regarded as future by the Apostles, and so presented by them to the churches. For example: Paul says, (Rom. ii. 7.) "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor, and immortality [*he will reward*] eternal life." He exhorts Timothy (1st ep. vi 12.) "to fight the good fight of faith, and to *lay hold* on eternal life." This he calls "the prize of their high calling," Phil iii. 14. And of the rich Christians, who you say could not get into the kingdom of heaven on earth, he says to Timothy, (1st ep. vi. 12.) "Charge the rich in this world to do good," &c. "that they may *lay hold* of eternal life." And of himself he says he "had not yet laid hold of the prize;" but (Titus i. 2.) "in hope of eternal life I am a servant of God," &c. "What a man hath why doth he yet hope for?" What say you, Mr. Skinner!!

22—My five proofs standing firm and unscathed by all you have alleged, I shall only add a sixth and dismiss this proposition. It is this:—The word Gehenna, or Hell, in the New Testament, can by no possibility of interpretation refer to any earthly punishment: for, besides the reasons already given, neither Jesus nor his Apostles did at any time threaten temporal, physical, or corporeal punishments to those who disobeyed the gospel; but, on the contrary, said, '*Of how much sorer punishment* than even the temporal calamities and death of the rebellious Jews, shall he be thought worthy who despises the gospel,' &c.

23—Perhaps by this time you will think that your last letter is sufficiently eviscerated without my stopping to descant upon the *impersonal* devil in which you believe, or whether you might not have chosen one of my four propositions rather than have heaped upon me two negatives and two affirmatives—to nullify and stultify each other; or to show how gratuitous it was for you to deny propositions that I never affirmed—such as that *heaven* and *hell* were *always* contrasted; and how inapposite your allusions to Baron Swedenborg's correspondence, and to hot and cold days, &c. &c. But I must tell you that your language is often too strong, and your assertions might at least not be quite so reckless as in the case of sincere penitence being the only hell or punishment which Divine Justice can ask or receive: for, sir, the passage quoted, paragraph 16, in my August letter, is every word taken from your own paper. I cannot here refer to the page, but think you will find it in the present volume from p. 50 to 60.

24—I have never noticed in your paper a copy of the propositions, rules of discussion, &c. signed by your hand; nor have I heard from you touching the tendering of the copy-right of our discussion to the Bible Society, &c. Pardon me for calling up these matters, if you have attended to them. I have only seen one of your papers for two months. I hope you will early despatch the reply to this, as I have been under the necessity of now writing two letters out of place through my absence from home. I am now on my way to the annual meeting of the Col-

Digitized by Google

lege of Teachers, Cincinnati, and expect to be at home about the 18th of October.——Yours, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

News from the Churches.

HIGGINSPORT, Ohio, August 22, 1837.

THE congregation in this place was organized in May, 1836, with 12 members. Since that time 36 have been added, 3 of whom have been excluded for *rebellion* against the laws of the King. We now number 45. We have 2 bishops and 3 deacons—meet every Lord's day to break the loaf—for prayer, praise, exhortation, and teaching. The brethren are living in love and union, and are generally very punctual in their attendance at all the meetings.

J. CLARK.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, Sept. 16. 1837.

We have just closed a three days' meeting, and six have been added to the saved in this place. Brother M'Manus and old Father Eccles were the laborers.

M. WINANS.

DAVIESS COUNTY, Kentucky, August 29, 1837.

We have since May added sixteen to our number, and I assure you the cause is growing every day. All we ask is a hearing, to prove to our Baptist brethren that we teach there is one God and one Mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all; one faith, one Lord, and one baptism; one body and one spirit.

SAMUEL HAYNES.

WOODSTOCK, Shenandoah county, Virginia, August 21, 1837.

The gospel (odiously called "Campbellism") is gradually progressing in this county.—There are some three or four congregations of disciples, most of whom meet on the first day of the week to attend to the ordinances. They number, taking into the account those who are not organized as a church, from three to four hundred. Two were added to the church meeting at Narrow Passage last Lord's day, by immersion. Additions have been made within the last three months to the several congregations in the county. I immersed 5 not long since in Page, the adjoining county. Here are 15 or 20 disciples, who will meet to attend to the institutions as soon as they can procure a house. I am happy to state, that a few weeks ago, while in Fredericksburg, I immersed two the "same hour of the night."

J. D. FERGUSON.

RANDOLPH COUNTY, Missouri, September 7, 1837.

On Friday before the first Lord's day in August, we commenced a three days' meeting on the waters of Salt River. The teaching brethren present were Reid Thompson and myself. During this meeting there were 6 immersed upon the good confession, 4 others added by letter to the infant congregation at that place, and many more seemed almost persuaded to be Christians. The prospect was truly flattering. Since which time I have immersed two in my own neighborhood. On Friday before the 3d Lord's day in August, I commenced preaching in the new county, north of Randolph, (Macon,) and continued in the county 5 days. During my stay there I immersed 4 more—making in all an addition of 12 to the Army of the Faith.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

STANFORD, Kentucky, September 2, 1837.

On the second Lord's day of last month I met with our brethren at Antioch meeting-house, in Garrard county; and, on special invitation, addressed the large congregation there assembled. The interest excited encouraged the brethren to continue their meetings in the place and surrounding neighborhood for nine successive days, and brought some

Digitized by Google

laboring brethren to our aid; in particular we rejoiced in the presence of brother T. Smith three days, and a passing visit of brother Calahan; while the long-continued services of brother Sacrey were as a main pillar to our efforts. Twenty one witnessed the good confession and were immersed, four united with our brethren from the Baptists, and an impression was made on the people at Antioch, Freedom, Lancaster, and Centreville favorable to Christianity as it was taught in the apostolic age.

In Stamford also, and at Rush Branch, during a period of six days we enjoyed a religious festival. The season was a time of refreshing, and eleven were obedient to the faith. On this occasion there was a correspondence opened mutually between several churches, and their messengers had before them the consideration of a proposition for mutual co-operation, in order more effectually to get their churches to walk in the ordinances of Christ blamelessly, and at the same time to give the preaching of the Word for the benefit of the world.

WILLIAM BLGG.

CENTREVILLE, Bourbon county, Ky. September 14, 1837.

Our yearly meeting was held this Fall at Union meeting-house, in Fayette county, about two miles from this place, and commenced on Friday the 21st of September, and continued five days. The brethren who attended during the meeting and are in the habit of public speaking, were, Challen, Raines, Rogers, Brown of Indiana, Flemming, Irvin, Taffe, Williams, Parker, Morrow, Patterson, Flournoy, Whittington, and myself. Several of these brethren were compelled to leave before the close of the meeting. The first named four brethren were our principal laborers on the occasion in word and doctrine. The weather was most propitious, and an immense concourse assembled from day to day.—Very many brethren and sisters from various sections of country, far and near, had come up to worship with us. The one blessed Spirit of the Lord appeared to animate them all—each one prayed, or sung, or exhorted, or aided in some way to advance the general good. The result was most glorious and happy:—Thirty-four in all came forward to join us in our march to a better world. The good impression made on the minds of the people was so apparent that after the close of the meeting, although nearly exhausted, I resolved with the help of the Lord to hold the truth steadily in their view. Aided by G. W. Williams we held several meetings in close succession. The effect was most excellent: eleven more obeyed the Lord—making in all forty-five in less than two weeks past. Experience and observation have convinced me, that, in order to permanent good, after such a time, we must go on and carefully teach them to observe all things that the Lord has commanded.—We will, then, by the aid of the Lord, endeavor to instruct, enlighten, build up, establish, and confirm their souls with the powerful Word.

Our next annual meeting will be held (the Lord willing) at Cooper's Run meeting-house, about three miles from Paris, in this county, and will commence on Friday before the second Lord's day in September, 1838, to continue at least four days.

JNO. ALLEN GANO.

JACKSONVILLE, Illinois, September 26, 1837.

In the single county of Morgan, during the present summer and fall, nearly 75 souls have confessed the Saviour and been immersed for the semission of sins.

D. P. N. HENDERSON.

BEDFORD, Pennsylvania, August 17, 1837.

I have just returned from the state of New York, where I spent eleven weeks. Through the united labors of brother Sanders of this state, who accompanied me and brothers Shepard and Bartlett of that state, 84 were immersed, 18 of whom were in Clarence, Erie county, and vicinity; 20 at Castile, Genesee county; 7 at Woolcort; 10 at Butler, Wayne county; 4 at Cicero, Onondaga county, and vicinity; 4 at Ira, and 39 at Mentz, near Auburn, Cayuga county.

Besides this, several new places have been opened. In Medina, Orleans county, we have had a good hearing, and a number of the Baptists in that place have admitted that the things they have heard are so. In Plymouth brother Shepard and myself had a large and attentive audience, mostly Congregationalists. It was the first time they had heard and

Digitized by Google

they were anxious to hear more. We next visited Freetown, Cortland county. The Baptists of this place opened their house, and they with their elder and a Methodist clergyman gave us their undivided attention for six discourses. The harvest is great, but the laborers are few. J. J. MOSS.

During the Editor's late tour upon the Western Reserve the churches appeared in a prosperous condition. Thirteen persons were immersed at Hubbard, five at Warren, and nineteen at Euclid.

During the last month, under the labors of M. Bosworth, M. Clapp, and others, forty persons have been added to the churches at Bethany, Va., Dutch Fork, West Liberty, and Wellsburg. R. R.

From the Christian Preacher.

SUCCESS OF THE GOSPEL—EXTRAORDINARY.

About the 12th ultimo I left the city on a short tour to Louisville, New Albany, and Shelbyville, having previously written a request to brother J. T. Johnson to meet me at the last named place, if possible. Some obeyed on the tour; but instead of finding my fellow-laborer at Shelbyville, I received a letter from him saying, "In five days I have received in this county, (Madison, Ky.) about thirty-six persons, mostly by baptism, but a few of those from the Baptists. Get into the stage and come instantly to my aid, as it is doubtful whether I shall be able to speak to-morrow, I am so worn down." As he had been making repeated requests for me to come to that county for two months before, I started and by stage and horse reached the ground, 70 miles distant, in 16 hours. The work had grown, and brethren Creath, Jr., Hall, and Adams had "come to the help of the Lord," though they soon left, except brother Hall, who remained a week. There was no unusual excitement; at different points in the county the people met and heard the word and obeyed it in joy and simplicity of heart; and when brother Johnson and myself left the county the 4th inst., *one hundred and eighty-five* persons had obeyed the Lord in three weeks!! Bless his name! These included a vast majority of heads of families and a portion of the most respectable society of the county, persons who filled honorable stations in the service of their country. As the word was preached in many parts of the county, it had a fair opportunity of selecting the noble-hearted, like those of Berea. This accession swells the number of disciples collected in that county within a year or eighteen months, to about 200. On my way home I spoke in Lexington, and a young gentleman devoted himself to the Lord, by a confession of his name; and now I am at home, Sept. 7th, and after stage transportation over the fastnesses of Eagle Creek hills in a dark and rainy night, and after having travelled 4 or 500 miles and delivered near 40 discourses in 27 days, through the blessing of God I am less fatigued than I have been on trips of less labor. Brother Johnson's strength was wonderfully sustained also; Madison owes him a debt of gratitude. [*Edit. C. P.*]

EXCERPTS.

Man being a reasonable, and so a thinking creature, there is nothing more worthy of his being than the right direction and employment of his thoughts, since upon this depends both his usefulness to the public and his own present and future benefit in all respects.——*Wm. Penn.*

The uncultivated man is contented, if he see but something going on; the man of more refinement must be made to feel; the man entirely refined, desires to reflect.——*Goethe.*

A person of a slender but correct understanding may produce more agreeable effects on others, than a perplexed and unpurified genius.—*Id.*

ERRATUM.—Page 536, 16th line from top, for "216 pages 32mos." read 202 *pages* 18*mo*.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

NEW SERIES.

NUMBER XII.—*VOLUME* I.

BETHANY, VA. *December*, 1837.

MR. LYND ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

MR. STEVENS, the Editor of the "*Cross and Baptist Journal*," has, with the concurrence, no doubt, of Mr. Lynd, inserted in his columns and given in a single paper the whole of my reply to Mr. Lynd's essay on my views of converting power, as he understands them. For this act of justice these gentlemen are entitled to my thanks. Mr. Beebee, of the "*New York Baptist Register*, has not, so far as I have seen, been so honorable: he has not yet disabused the minds of his readers from the unfavorable impressions he endeavored to create against me. I do hope that that gentleman will take into his most grave consideration the well-established principle, that *justice* is the foundation of all the social virtues.

Mr. Lynd has given both a pre-view and a re-view of my speculations upon his specifications of my heterodoxy on that subject. The former preceded, and the latter succeeded the appearance of my reply in the aforesaid Journal. The former is short and very pithy; while the latter is both long and broad, without being either deep or high. A single paragraph completes the pre-view, while one broad side of the Cross and Journal, with a column and a half on a second broad side are engrossed with the re-view. As it would be ineligible to our readers to have a part of the re-view in one volume and the remainder of it in another; and as we could not, with any regard to the subjects on hand, in a final number, insert both articles, we shall confine ourselves to the pre-view in the present volume, and file the re-view for the next.

I have said the pre-view is short, but pithy. It concentrates in a single blow the force of full seven columns of the re-view; for while the latter is like the peltings of a corkwood hammer, the former resembles the engine force of a battering ram. I shall not farther detain my readers from the pleasure of reading it for themselves:—

Digitized by Google

"*The Influences of the Holy Spirit.*—It will be recollected by the readers of the Cross and Journal, that some time since I furnished some remarks upon the views of Mr. Campbell on the subject that stands at the head of this article. To these remarks Mr. Campbell has replied in the Harbinger, commencing with the number in July, and concluding with that in September. My essay makes about six pages of the Harbinger, and I do not much admire its division into three parts, each at a month's distance from the reader. Perhaps I have no right to complain, and yet I think that Mr Campbell might have given it to his readers with more profit *as a whole*, and especially as he must perceive that the entire merit of the *reformation* is suspended on this subject. But without further introductory remarks, and designing to answer it in the Cross and Journal of next week, I give you the reply of Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Campbell "*must* perceive"—what?—! "that the ENTIRE MERIT of the *reformation* is suspended on this subject"! What a compliment! Yes, I must *perceive* that the *entire* MERIT of all that has been said, written, and done during our editorial career of almost fifteen years, is, by the Herculean power of Mr. Lynd's imagination, condensed into the nutshell dimensions of a single speculation on the metaphysics of some abstract entity about what is not so much as once named in the Bible.—Yet, in our judgment, were all that is written and preached on this subject expunged from the reformation that we plead, it would not be minus half the value of the annual tithe of the mint, anise, and cummin of the poorest and the strictest Pharisee in the worst days of Judah and Benjamin. The best refutation of this (may I call it) unintentional reproach which we could offer, would be a synopsis of the grand items of the reformation for which we have contended and still contend. But this would require more leisure and consideration than we now have at command. Nevertheless, we shall give a bold sketch of the prominent landmarks, accompanied with some explanatory remarks, for the benefit of our more recent readers.

Synopsis of Reformation Principles and Objects.

CHAP. I.

FOR THE HEALING OF DIVISIONS AMONG CHRISTIANS AND THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION, THE FOLLOWING OBJECTS AND PRINCIPLES HAVE BEEN PROPOSED AND DISCUSSED:—

1. *The restoration of a pure speech, or the calling of Bible things by Bible names.*

Primitive Judaism was greatly corrupted before, but the sacred dialect was almost wholly lost during the Babylonish captivity. The reformers of that day that brought Israel back, began the work by restoring a pure speech. So must we now. We must adopt the Bible

Digitized by Google

nomenclature in preference to the new names, the barbarous words and phrases of scholastic divinity. More than half the religious controversies are about words of foreign importation, which have made obsolete or supplanted the diction of the Holy Spirit. As a sovereign cure and preventive of Protestant partyism, we therefore respectfully propose to call Bible things by Bible names, and scholastic opinions by scholastic names.

2. *The Bible must be proposed as a book of facts, not of doctrines, nor opinions; it must be understood and regarded as arranged upon the principle of cause and effect, or that action is to produce corresponding action.*

We shall explain this most important item by a few remarks. When we say that the Bible is a book of facts, we mean that it contains the sayings and the doings of God and men, faithfully represented in words.

The scheme or plan of its arrangement is expressed in five words—viz. *Fact, testimony, faith, feeling, action.* These terms are peculiarly co-extensive, and represent the same thing in five attitudes. We have the love of God in fact, in testimony, in faith, in feeling, and in action. For example, the gift of Jesus is the love of God in fact; the report of it is the love of God in word or testimony; the belief of it is the love of God in our faith; the feeling of repentance, gratitude, joy, &c. is the love of God in feeling; and our obedience to all divine precepts and promises, is the love of God in our actions. This is action producing corresponding action. Fact, then, is any thing said or done; testimony is the representation of it in words; faith the belief of those words; feeling the force or power of those words; and action the effect of them. Now that they stand in the relation of cause and effect, is most obvious: for testimony is the proximate cause of faith; faith, of feeling; and feeling of action. For example;—the tears of Mary are the effect of her feelings; her feelings, the effect of her faith in the death of her husband James; her faith, the effect of the testimony of the original witnesses; and their testimony, in one point of view, is the effect of the death of James; while, in another point of view, it is the fact itself in word. In descending from the fact to the action, the connexion and dependence are still more apparent. We have first the death of James, then the testimony, then the faith, then the feeling in the bosom of Mary, and then the tears. Without the four first the last could not be; yet it is admitted that the four first might be without the last.

Facts are the Alpha and the Omega of the Bible. The first statement in the first verse is a fact that is past: it ends with a statement of a fact that is to come. Now in redeeming society from the confusion and collision of so many artificial and conflicting theories of religion and

Digitized by Google

of the Bible, it may be expedient to show that there is but one natural, rational, and immutable arrangement of things; in the order, too, of cause and effect, which is diverse from every human system of religion in the world. The philosophy of the plan on which the Bible proceeds is summarily this: There must be something done before it can be reported; it must be reported before it can be believed; it must be believed before it can be felt, and it must be felt before a corresponding course of action can be instituted. Thus, Jesus died for our sins before the Apostles testified it; they testified it before we believed it; we believed it before we felt penitence or a disposition to return to God; and we felt this penitence and disposition to return to God before we actually reformed our lives.

It is by reasonings of this sort that we sustain our allegata concerning numerous systems of doctrine as being unphilosophic, unscriptural, and injurious to society. Indeed all abstract doctrines are useless as respects the edification of saints, or the conversion of sinners. They are matters purely intellectual, addressed to the understanding rather than to the heart. They employ our powers of discrimination more than they engage the affections or sanctify the heart. We value the above expose of the Bible scheme, not only because it will, in our judgment, be found strictly and immutably true, but because of its utility in directing the labors of those engaged in the conversion of the world. They will rely much more upon presenting the wonderful facts of man's redemption in demonstration of the love of God, than upon the explanation of the terms, or upon proving the truth of any abstract and speculative proposition about the doctrines of the Bible.

3. *The Bible alone, instead of any human creed, as the only rational and solid foundation of Christian union and communion.*

We have abundantly shown, and all the pages of ecclesiastic history irrefragably show, that so many creeds, so many parties; and that every reformation of a human creed has produced a new party in religion.

4. *The reading and expounding of the sacred scriptures in public assemblies instead of text preaching, sermonizing, and philosophizing.*

Text-preaching and sermon-making is a trade that has been driven much to the disadvantage both of the Bible and the community. We donot say that a person may not speak good sense and to the point for an hour upon justification, sanctification, election, sacrifice, &c. &c.; but it is exceedingly difficult to do so without perverting both the text and the context if he follow the modern plan. However, text-preaching

Digitized by Google

is quite a modern invention, and was wholly unknown in the age of the Prophets and Apostles: and this alone is enough to secure its scriptural reprobation by all who believe in the plenary inspiration and guidance of the original preachers of the gospel. This scheme has filled the pulpit with a race of pigmies in the Bible as diminutive as ever lived. The manufacture of skeletons and forms of sermons is quite a business, and a person hazards the Demetrian censure for calling it in question. Preaching is thus made easy, and in this day of *reading* rather than of speaking discourses, a person of very ordinary capacity, and with little or no knowledge of the Bible, and for a few dollars worth of skeletons, may become a celebrated preacher—as orthodox as the Pope, and as eloquent as Dr. Chalmers or Robert Hall.*

5. *The right of private opinion in all matters not revealed in contradistinction from the common faith, without the forfeiture of Christian character or Christian privilege.*

The difference which not mere definition, but reason and truth, make between knowledge, faith, and opinion, should be clearly and broadly drawn; and while unity *in the faith* ought to be essential to Christian co-operation, differences in all matters of opinion should be borne without any diminution of all the kindliest charities of the Christian spirit. In this way alone can any community long enjoy the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

So readeth the first chapter, or such are the peculiarities of the doctrine of reformation as respects the present state of Protestant Christendom.

CHAPTER II.

Principles and Objects of Church Reform.

1. *The church of Jesus Christ is constitutionally composed of those who have confessed their faith in the celestial proposition*—That Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God, *and the only Saviour of the world, and have put him on by a baptism into his death.*

Though Jesus Christ said he should build his church upon this rock foundation, and Paul asserts that no other can be laid as of divine

* The following account of Parson Adams' fine sermon would suit some very popular discourses on fashionable texts, which we have had not the pleasure but the pain to hear. Lord Lyttleton makes the Parson thus tell the story:—"It was the best discourse I had to my back. It was divided into three parts: The first was taken from Clarke; the second from Abernethy, and the third was composed by myself; and the two practical observations were translated from a Latin sermon preached and printed at Oxford in the year of our Lord 1735. It had four beginnings and seven conclusions; by the help of which I preached it with equal success on Christmas day for the benefit of a charity, at a florist's feast, an assize, an archdeacon's visitation, and a funeral, besides common occasions."

Digitized by Google

authority; yet no society of our acquaintance requires such a distinct confession in order to baptism or church membership. It is peculiar to the disciples of Christ. Experience, called Christian, or subscription to some dogmas of doctrine, are required in all other professing communities.

2. *The administration of the internal and external affairs of the church is placed in the hands of bishops, deacons, and messengers extraordinary.*

These officers as naturally and as necessarily belong to the Christian church, as the head, the hand, and the foot to the human body. Every individual community needs them. A single congregation elects, ordains, and sanctifies them for its own use and service. The tenure of none of these offices is perpetual, nor does the incumbent possess universal authority.

The jurisdiction of the bishop's office of teaching and ruling extends only to one congregation, and during good behaviour. The deacon's office is also limited to the temporal concerns of a single church, whether he serve in the capacity of a door-keeper, lamp-lighter, almoner, treasurer, or purveyor for the congregation. Should any of these officers migrate to another community, he must enter it in the capacity of a private member, and so continue till elected, ordained, and sanctified by the new church of which he is now a member.

The messengers extraordinary, sometimes called "evangelists," "ministers," "messengers," "apostles of the churches," are persons sanctified and sent out by the church on errands belonging to the external relations of the church. Of this sort are the preachers or evangelists sent abroad into the world for the conversion of sinners and the setting up and setting in order new churches.* There may be other messengers extraordinary, besides these in the discharge of any of those relative duties which belong to the co-operation of the churches in any state or nation in the great concerns of the common salvation.

3. *The sanctification of the Lord's day by meeting in honor of the resurrection of the Saviour, and especially with a reference to the celebration of the Lord's supper, is essential to the edification, to the spirituality, holiness, usefulness, and happiness of the Christian community.*

It is not designed to throw into the shade any other duties of the Christian church while contending for those above stated; but because no society, save the disciples of Christ, so regard, observe, and celebrate

* Some parties, without a single text in the Bible to sanction it, license persons to preach abroad, while they forbid them to administer any of the positive institutions of the kingdom.

Digitized by Google

the Lord's day, we endeavor to arrest the attention of our fellow-professors to the great design of it, and of the coming together of the members of Christ's family on that day. When assembled for this chief purpose, the reading of the scriptures, teaching, exhortation, prayer, praise, contributions for the poor, and discipline when called for, are all in order and necessary to the advancement and growth of the Christian church in all the graces of the Spirit and in all the fruits of holiness.

4. *The church not being of this world, cannot levy any contribution on those without for any religious or political purpose, neither ought she to go a begging to the world for aid to support or extend Christianity.*

Thus readeth the second chapter of reform. In this synopsis it will be remembered we do not detail every thing, nor prove any thing; but only state the prominent points which have been stated, elaborated, and sustained in the current reformation. We therefore hasten to

CHAPTER III.

Principles essential to the proper dispensation of the Gospel.

1. *The gospel is not a theory, a doctrine, a system of moral or spiritual philosophy; not even the theory of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, adoption, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life.*

That a person must believe, and believe before he can repent, and repent before he can be scripturally baptized; and that all these must precede his admission into the Christian church and the enjoyment of the privileges of the new covenant, is most scripturally true; but yet this is not the gospel. Nor is a correct definition of faith, repentance, baptism, justification, the Holy Spirit, eternal life; nor the most philosophic or biblical arrangement of them, the gospel of Christ. Much less can the five dogmatic points of Calvinism or Arminianism constitute the gospel; but the gospel is the proclamation in the name of God of remission of sins and eternal life through the sacrifice and mediation of Jesus Christ, to every one that obeys him in the instituted way.

It is not the preaching of faith, but of THE FAITH; it is not a display of the significance, value, and importance of faith, repentance, baptism, regeneration, justification, sanctification, or any other word or phrase, or thing in the Bible; but it is a clear, full, and authoritative statement of pardon and eternal life from the philanthropy of God through the interposition of Jesus in a positive institution. It is pardon and eternal life by putting ourselves under the guidance of Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

2. *Three things are essential to a Christian—a peculiar disposition, state, and character. These must be changed from a preternatural or fleshly state to that which is spiritual and heavenly.*

Finding the gospel veiled in the scholastic jargon of an untaught and unintelligible style, we have long wrestled in favor of a more simple and consistent view of the value of faith, repentance, and baptism as introductory to the Christian state, and to make the difference between change of heart, or disposition, and state and character as striking as possible. These three are not one, nor to be confounded with each other. A new heart is not pardon nor justification, nor is pardon a new heart. Justification is not sanctification, nor is pardon a new character. The Holy Spirit as now ministered by Christ (for Jesus is now Lord of the Spirit) convinced the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment by three arguments: of sin, because they believed not on him; of righteousness, because he went to the Father; of judgment, because the Prince of this world was judged by him. This, when understood, changes the disposition or state of the mind. Faith, repentance, and baptism change the state of the person, and conformity to this new state makes the new character.

3. *The resurrection of the just, the coming of the Lord Jesus in his own proper glorified person, and eternal life, constitute the grand objects of the Christian's hope*

We are thus explicit on this subject because we have found many who say they "have got a hope that their sins are pardoned." There neither is nor can be such a hope. Hope has always a future object; and pardon is never proposed to sinners as an object future to those in the Christian state. What a person has he cannot hope for. He that has his sins forgiven cannot hope for forgiveness. The Christian hope for which he is commanded always to furnish a reason, or to be ready to do it, is not pardon nor justification, regeneration nor sanctification, but eternal life at the coming of the Lord.

1. *No theory of spiritual influence in conversion is the influence of the Spirit. Therefore, to deny any theory, is not to deny the influence of the Spirit.*

The theory which has frequently led to enthusiasm and fanaticism, and which necessarily tends that way, and which directly makes the testimony of God of no value, is the only theory which our views of propriety would permit us to oppose. That theory of regeneration which imparts a holy principle, regenerates a person, or works faith in his heart physically, or without the instrumentality of the word, inde-

Digitized by Google

pendent of the word and without any knowledge of it, is, in our judgment, of ruinous tendency. There may be other theories somewhat injurious and worthy of exposure; but this, with us, is indubitably so. Some of the sects are now disowning it.* But it is a part, *an essential part* of Calvinism, Arminianism, and Fullerism; for, without it, as they teach, there is no salvation for infants—not even for elect infants!!

The Presbyterian and Baptist Confessions of Faith, now lying before me, positively thus declare, "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."—[*Westminster and Baptist Confessions of Faith, ch.* 10, *art.* 3.] This physical, metaphysical, systematic, without the word regeneration, is that theory which has occasioned so much discussion and gained for us so many reproaches and calumnies. There is not a text in the Bible which can be quoted, that squints in the least to such a dogma. Hence the Westminster Divines only refer to Luke xviii. 15, 16. John iii. 8. Acts ii. 38, 39. and iv. 12th verse to prove it; in none of which, more than in the 1st verse of Genesis, is there an allusion to physical regeneration.

We have not room nor inclination now to dwell on the necessity of a more rational and scriptural system of interpreting the scriptures, nor to expatiate on how many passages of the Good Book have been rescued from the mystifications and perversions of enthusiasm and sectarianism during the pending controversies, and shall conclude with a specification or two under a fourth head.

CHAPTER IV.

Personal and Family Reformation.

1. *As personal intelligence, purity, and happiness is the end of all public or private, theoretic or practical reformation, the present standard of personal knowledge, faith, piety, and morality being too low, must be greatly elevated.*

The church is filled with an ignorant, faithless, carnal, and immoral class of professors, the natural result of the operation of text-preaching, sermonizing, and speculating upon points of doctrine and sound notions.

* The Rev. Mr. Styles, of Kentucky, a Presbyterian Minister, in a conference with me at Versailles, Kentucky, last month, affirmed that neither Methodist, Baptist, nor Presbyterians believed this doctrine of regeneration without the word. And Mr. Lynd appears to be on the same side of the question. I hope these gentlemen will not slur this question and hide it from the public. They ought to repudiate the Confession or else manfully defend the doctrine. We avow our sentiments, and defend them. We expect the same frankness from our opponents.

Digitized by Google

The scriptures are not studied, read, conversed upon, laid up in the heart, and consequently not drawn out into the life of a large majority of professors. Those communities that have settled Pastors are no better than those that have none, because most of their Pastors are as carnal, political, selfish, as much money-loving and money-seeking as themselves, and have not time to attend upon the spiritual interests of their charge. If such persons are clear from the blood of all men, then was Paul a supererogatist as respected his labors in Ephesus.

2. *Family education and domestic religion must be, I need not say, greatly advanced, but begun.*

We have nominal Christian parents with almost Pagan families in all churches in the land. We mean that there are many professed Christian parents who almost wholly neglect their families, and suffer them to grow up without religious and moral culture; and of the few who practise the forms of family religion, but a very small portion take much pains to instruct their children and servants in the way of the Lord. There are, indeed, by very many professors, infinite pains taken to raise up families for the best circles on earth; but how little to qualify the poor deluded youth of those families for the heavenly circles. We want, and must have, a radical and thorough reformation in family religion and family education. In respect to both personal and family religion and education, we need more reading of God's Book, more meditating upon it, more conversation about it, more praying, more singing, more fasting, more rejoicing, more zeal, more morality, more truth, more honesty, and infinitely less dissimulation, duplicity, bargain and promise-breaking, selfishness, and carnality amongst professors, than we now find amongst large masses of the evangelicals of our day.

Such is a miniature view of the four chapters of the much-needed reformation for which we contend; and in effecting which we have been so much impeded by the cry of "heresy" from the men on the walls of Zion, who ought to have with heart and hand aided us in this great and all-important work.

My friend Mr. Lynd may say that he opposes only a few of these points of reform. Still he is opposed to more than one or two of them; and although the Baptist *system* may be mid-way between the orthodox and the Bible, still other Protestant Christians are greatly in advance of them in some respects, so that they all need as much of the merits of the present reformation, and perhaps equal rations, if all things were duly estimated.

So much is respectfully submitted in answer to Mr. Lynd's pre-view, as above quoted. A. C.

Digitized by Google

DIALOGUE
BETWEEN MARTIN LUTHER & THE MONK ERASTIAN.

[*Never before published.*]

Erastian. FRIEND LUTHER, What think you has become of your pious father?

Luther. He has gone to heaven, sir, I doubt not.

Erastian. And your mother too?

Luther. Yes, and my mother too; and my grand father and grand mother also: for Saxony can boast of no Catholics more devout than they.

Erastian. And in the name of both Saint Peter and Saint Paul, why have you raised all this fuss in Germany and throughout the world? Do you expect any thing better than to go to heaven when you die?

Luther. Nothing better than to enjoy heaven.

Erastian. If, then, your pious ancestors, who lived and died in the bosom of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, have gone to heaven as you believe, how dare you separate from that church? Are you sure that, separated from that church, you can arrive at heaven? Besides, you say you can promise yourself no more than heaven where you now stand; why not, then, have kept the good company of your virtuous ancestors, and walked with them in the good old way, rather than be enrolled with heretics and hazard so much for nothing gained!

Luther. 'For nothing gained!!' Why, sir, I have gained every thing in renouncing the Pope—peace of mind and the joyful hope of heaven.

Erastian. Remember you have conceded that your ancestors gained heaven in the Church of Rome: and why could not you?

Luther. Because they were *pious* members of that church, which I could not possibly be.

Erastian. Why not?

Luther. Because I have been favored with more knowledge than they.

Erastian. This is the first time in my life that I have heard 'more knowledge' assigned as a cause of impiety.

Luther. You astonish me! Why, sir, there is not a casuist in the Greek or Roman Church that does not agree with me.

Erastian. Agree with you in what?

Luther. That '*more knowledge*' always condemns.

Erastian. 'More knowledge' than what?

Luther. More knowledge than conformity. To speak plainly, more knowledge of the will of God than conformity to it, is rather impious that pious. Let me ask you, sir, what is piety?

Digitized by Google

Erastian. Piety is the worship of God.

Luther. The worship of God according to the knowledge of his will, or without the knowledge of his will?

Erastian. According to the knowledge of his will; for the worship of God must be regulated by the will of God.

Luther. True, most true: the worship of God must be regulated by the will of God. This is all that I ask. This kept in mind, and you may easily perceive why I could not be a pious member of the Church of Rome, though my parents were. They lived in conformity to all they knew, and died in the church; I live in conformity to what know, and have left the church. Now, as it would have been impossible for them to have been pious without this conformity to known duty, so would it be impossible for me to be a pious member of the Roman Church. And do you think I could have been saved in the Church of Rome without piety?

Erastian. Not without piety; for I believe there are Popes and Cardinals, and Bishops and Monks in hell, who died in the church as they lived in it—without piety and without virtue.

Luther. A little farther, and you may become a Protestant!

Erastian. No danger. I can be pious in the church as you can be out of it.

Luther. And may not I be at least as pious out of it as you can be in it, according to your own definition of piety: for have we not both agreed that the ratio of piety is the ratio of conformity to the revealed will of God?

Erastian. We have; but we have not agreed in that part of the revealed will of God that commands separation from the Church of Rome.

Luther. We have not debated that point. Let us first decide this one. You sought to ensnare me through a concession which I made for the sake of the living and the dead; but you did not understand my concession, or else you have assumed a false principle in reasoning.—Your hypothesis is, *that I might be pious, virtuous, and happy by living in accordance with the knowledge of my ancestors, rather than by living in accordance with my own.* This is both a common and a pernicious error; and I verily believe that millions are deluded by it into the idolatry of the Pope; who, were it not for it, might have saved themselves and their posterity from the worst tyranny ever usurped over man. Why, sir, I could as rationally expect to live upon the food that my forefathers eat as to be approved by God for living as they lived, or in conformity to their knowledge. Indeed no man can be justified to-day by living in accordance with the knowledge that he had yesterday. As soon shall the adult man live upon the milk of the infant man, as

Digitized by Google

any Christian please God or enjoy spiritual life by living this year according to the measure of his knowledge last year. Every man that continues in the Greek Church or Roman Church one hour after he sees its errors, because, as he alleges, many good people have lived and died in it, sins against reason, against conscience, and against God, according to a thousand decisions on other subjects by the most learned casuists in Rome or Constantinople.

Erastian. You would have us perpetually changing in order to our perfection. The perfection of mutability! What a glorious perfection is the perfection of Protestantism!

Luther. Jesus Christ himself grew in knowledge; and we are commanded to grow in grace, even in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour. Certainly as the brain grows the heart should grow; and the outward man should be proportioned to the inner. But this is not the question. Should we now, enlightened as we are, conform to the requisitions of a church which has been degenerating every hour for a thousand years, because she was once pure, or because our fathers lived and died in her embraces?

Erastian. I do not believe in this awful degeneracy, and therefore I cannot answer such questions.

Luther. But you believe in continuing in a church after we are convinced of its errors, because our good ancestors died in it; and you argue the possibility of our piety in a corrupt church, from the fact of their alleged piety, who lived in better times, with other views, and under less opportunities of information than have been vouchsafed to us.

Erastian. I admit that the church may be in need of reformation of manners, and that we should attempt that as often as there is need; but I do not believe that the church ever errs in doctrine, and therefore I cannot accord to any person the right of changing a single point of doctrine.

Luther. Yes, I know you assume this mysterious paradox, that a person may have a most excellent and perfect constitution, and yet be sick every day of his life; and hence the ease in swallowing the dogma that the church may be infallibly sound in doctrine and excessively depraved in practice. But let me tell you this is not the point on which you assailed me. Stick to that point. Remember you would have me live and die in the church because my father died in it, and make me pious by conforming to what he knew, instead of obeying the light which God has given me.

Erastian. Of this, at a more convenient season, we may converse again. At present adieu! A. C.

Digitized by Google

FAVORABLE OMENS.

"TEMPORA MUTANTUR ET NOS MUTAMUR IN ILLIS."

For the benefit of our English readers we translate as follows:—

'THE TIMES ARE CHANGED AND WE CHANGE'—TENETS WITH BOOKS AND PRINCIPLES WITH MEN.

TIME was when some Baptists and Presbyterians affected to laugh at us for our scriptural simplicity in addressing those sometimes called Elders and Ministers by the apostolic designation of Bishops. We are pleased to observe, that, in this instance, as in many others, after having been denounced for innovation, or heresy, or something worse, our views and arguments are being recommended, sanctioned, and approved by those very denominations which ten or twelve years ago most cavalierly and superciliously passed us by with a disdainful frown. We forgive all this, and rejoice to see that our views of new translations, new versions, Bible names for Bible things, &c. &c., as well as our most obnoxious views of baptism for remission of sins, "*in some sense*," and our opposition to physical metaphysical conversions and regenerations, are being treated much more courteously than we expected to see in our own lifetime.

We quote the following from the "Religious Herald," a Baptist paper, published in Richmond by our good friend William Sands—sanctioned by Baptists and Presbyterians I think our "Christian Baptist" overtures will yet be voted for by the majority of evangelical professors. "Great is the truth and mighty above all things, and shall prevail!"

"MINISTERIAL TITLES—BISHOP.

"We find the following query in the New York Evangelist, a Presbyterian paper:—

'We ask the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist churches, by what authority they withhold in common dialect the scriptural title of Bishop from their own acknowledged ministry?'

"The editor of the Evangelist is commenting on some remarks on the divine right of Episcopacy in the Chronicle of the Church, and in the course of his remarks he proposes the above query. As it regards the title, bishop, we humbly conceive it might justly be claimed by every pastor of a Baptist church. They are undoubtedly scriptural bishops, as much entitled, in our opinion, to the appellation, as those termed bishops in the Episcopal or Methodist churches. The title is not used, because others have been adopted, and some good brethren think that it would savor somewhat of pride or presumption should it now be assumed. We should be very willing to see it generally adopted in our denomination—as we think it would be preferable to Elder. As for Reverend, as it is a relic of the Popish church, we think it ought in

Digitized by Google

justice to be transferred back again to that anti-Christian sect. As honest Bunyan remarks, we wish to own none of the wares or baubles they so temptingly offer at Vanity Fair.

'Our Presbyterian brethren have, to a partial extent, used the term Bishop in designating the pastors of their churches. Dr. Ely, whilst editor of the Presbyterian, in giving the statistics of his denomination made use of the term Bishop for minister. In the work of reform, as some one must act as pioneer, we suggest to the editor of the Evangelist the propriety of carrying out his principle into practical effect, by adopting the title Bishop in his paper, when he has occasion to refer to a ministering brother. In time the example might, perhaps, be generally adopted. Bishop is certainly the most appropriate and scriptural title for the pastor or overseer of a church."

TYNDALE'S VERSION.

In connexion with the above pleasing indications, I am pleased to add the following from the "Biblical Repository" for October, 1837. p. 495:—

"The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By William Tyndale, the martyr. The original edition, 1526, being the first vernacular translation from the Greek. With a memoir of his life and writings. To which are annexed, the essential variations of Coverdale's, Thomas Matthew's, Cranmer's, the Genevan, and the Bishops' Bible, as marginal readings. By J. P. Dabney. *Andover and New York: Gould & Newman*, 1837.

"This is one of the most interesting books, we may say it without misgiving, ever issued from the American press. It is the first translation of the New Testament made from the original Greek into the English language. It is the model and prototype of all the subsequent versions, which, indeed, with the exception of our authorized version, were mere revisions of Tyndale. James' translators did, doubtless, investigate the original Greek and Hebrew, (some of them were excellent scholars for their times,) yet their labors, in a great part, so far as the New Testament is concerned, consisted in transcribing Tyndale. This fact argues nothing against their honesty or ability, or the excellence of the authorized version. The translators of this version in their preface, (the work of Bishop Smith, a translator and reviser,) testify that their own version 'is, *in no part*, a new translation. We never thought,' say they, 'that we should need to make a new translation, but to make a good one better; or, out of many good ones, one principal good one.' We think great injustice has been done to Tyndale. Efforts have been made to prove that he copied from Luther's German version, because forsooth he translates ECCLESIA *congregation*, instead of *church*, just as Luther translates it by GEMEINE rather than by *kirche*. The truth is, that Tyndale was familiar with Greek from his youth, while there is no evidence that he ever had a thorough knowledge of German. He writes like one at home in the original tongues. 'The Greek,' says he, 'agreeth more with the English than with the Latin, and the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than with the Latin.' A minute comparison of Tyndale's text with the Greek, with the Latin Vulgate, and with Luther's German, will demonstrate that Tyndale was no copier.

"The publication of this volume will increase our respect for the authorized version, while it will teach us to render honor to whom honor is due. Tyndale suffered unto death for the crime of translating the Bible, but rich fruit sprung up at once from the seed which he sowed in blood. His voice was scarcely silent in death, before seven or eight editions of his Testament were published in England, in accordance with the king's injunction.—The volume which Mr. Dabney has edited with so much industry and taste, contains, first, a reprint of Tyndale from Bagster's London edition; second, the essential variations of Coverdale's, Matthew's, Cranmer's, and the Genevan, and the Bishops' Bibles, as marginal readings, producing a complete variorum edition of the early vernacular versions; third, 105 pages of introductory matter, containing a preface, a very interesting memoir of Tyndale,—recast from Mr. Offor's memoir in Bagster's edition, list of Tyndale's writings, an account of the early vernacular versions, select collations of the first and second editions of Tyndale, and a tabular list of the most common distinctive expressions of Tyndale. A noble portrait of the martyr, and some other illustrations are added."

Will Messrs. Gould & Newman please send me forthwith a copy of the above *in sheets*, that I may speak advisedly on this subject to my

Digitized by Google

readers? This is a work which I have no doubt will greatly contribute to public edification. Our readers need not be informed of our views of the practical utility of new and old versions, compared with that of King James. A. C.

EXCURSIONS—*No. III.*

Brother Campbell,

Men will wrangle for religion, write for it, fight for it, die for it—any thing but live for it. The good in all ages have remarked this strange *bizarrerie* which induces men to love system for its own sake; to boast of plans which they never execute, and contend for theories which they will not practise.

All our religious quarrels are about theories and forms. No one thinks piety and morality the great objects of all religion worth a dispute. These can be dismissed at once with the sneer of contempt or the smile of ridicule. It is deemed quite enough to say of a man who refuses to be conformed to the world and spends much time in the study of the scriptures, in prayer, and in dispensing the sacred gifts of charity, 'What an eccentric man our friend S. C. is!' Or if he carry the matter so far as to renounce all earthly prospects that he may give himself wholly to the conversion of men from sin to righteousness, it will perhaps be inquired, 'Don't you think that rambling fellow E. A. S is partially deranged?' I sometimes think indeed that if our blessed Lord were himself to appear again in the character he formerly assumed, that his humility and meekness; his devotion; his spiritual mindedness, and his disregard of all that is esteemed by men, would subject him even now to the same reproach.

I do not say that there is no true theory or system of religion. System is nothing but the order or arrangement of the parts of which any thing consists, and the Divine Being has exhibited order in the religion which he has delivered to men, as he has also in the visible Creation. And it is indeed the same order,—to wit, the order of *cause and effect.* The same acknowledged laws obtain in both—that every effect must have a cause, and that every cause must precede the effect. Hence in religion (which is adapted to man as placed under the operation of these

Digitized by Google

laws) we have first, *facts*; second, the *testimony* respecting them; third, the *belief* of that testimony; fourth, the *feeling* excited by the facts thus believed and our relation to them; fifth, the *obedience* or *acts* induced by these convictions and emotions; sixth, the *happiness* experienced in the enjoyment of the blessings conferred by Him who is "the rewarder of those that diligently seek him."

I would say, however, that a knowledge of the true theory of religion is not necessary to a correct practice of its duties. If the peasant will humbly commit himself to the Divine guidance, and seek to know the will of God as revealed in the scriptures that he may perform it, he will reap the benefits and blessings of religion, as certainly as the philosopher who can discern the relations of its parts, and theorize upon its adaptation to the human mind. It is gratifying, doubtless, to recognize the order which obtains in the gospel, and to see how perfectly it is suited to the constitution and circumstances of men; just as it is pleasing to understand the process of digestion, and to discern the skill displayed in the arrangement of the apparatus by which food is appropriated to the support of the body; yet the great end of religion may be attained without any analysis or theory, just as the simple rustic may enjoy his food, and be sustained by it, though he be ignorant of the elements of which it is composed, and wholly unacquainted with any theory of digestion or assimilation.

But since the days of Mother Eve, it has been the fashion to prefer knowledge to duty, and such is now the rage for fine-spun theories of religion, that its purposes seem to be wholly forgotten. Instead of the comfortable garments of righteousness which the Lord has provided, men choose the flimsy fig-leaves of system, which can neither defend them from the elements nor conceal their nakedness. The love of God, and of mankind, personal and family devotion, public and social improvement, are matters most unhappily, most generally, and most *religiously* disregarded by the community.

I wish I could say that some of our brethren had not fallen into the common error, and, in their zeal for a correct theory of the gospel, overlooked its personal and practical bearings. Jude indeed exhorts to 'contend earnestly for the faith once delivered

Digitized by Google

to the saints,' but I presume that Jude had not, any more than James, a regard for faith without obedience—for that "dead faith," that lifeless body which has formed so good a *subject for dissection* in the hands of metaphysical Doctors. It is high time that the spiritual-mindedness; consecration to God in body, soul, spirit, and estate; and watchfulness with prayer, required by the gospel, should be urged and enforced by every possible means, and that less should be said about theories of religion in public and private.

In the family circle too, for the most part, there is by no means sufficient attention paid to practical piety, or to the means by which this is nourished and sustained. There is too much vain and unprofitable conversation, and too much attention paid to the body, and too little to the improvement of the mind. I do not see why men should feed the body three times a-day and the soul but once; or why the soul should keep Lent forever, while the body observes a perpetual Easter. Next to private devotion in importance, is that of the family. It exerts the happiest influences over all who engage in it or witness it, and without it no family can be religiously educated or duly brought up in the nurture and instruction of the Lord.*

While we may regret these defects in the practice of Christianity, in common at least, if not equally with other religious denominations, there are, as it respects the order of the churches, some deficiencies which are perhaps peculiar to ourselves. In escaping from the thraldom of clerical domination, not a few have run to the opposite extreme. They have mistaken license for liberty; and an undignified and irreverent familiarity for order

* While upon this point, I beg leave to suggest to our brethren the following plan of reading the scriptures in their families in connexion with other devotional exercises. I would propose, then, that two chapters or connected sections be read in the morning as soon as the family can be gathered together, and that these, prayer and praise being offered up, should be the subject of familiar conversation, and the matters presented in them be duly considered by the members of the family either before or during the morning meal.—When all are convened together again at the dinner-hour, (which is commonly observed with singular punctuality,) one chapter may be read, and, as before, become the topic of conversation during or after the repast. It takes but five minutes to read a chapter, which can be spared at the busiest season; and if persons are much hurried, and have no time to devote to religious conversation after dinner, the table-talk, usually devoted to worldly matters, can be redeemed to this more profitable purpose. At night, when the labors of the day are concluded, two chapters more should be read and the evening spent in religious edification and improvement, in prayer and praise. The Bible may be read in this way either continuously in the common order of its books, or it may be divided into three parts—from Genesis to the book of Job; from the book of Job to the end of Malachi, leaving the New Testament as the third part, and each of these may be appropriated to its particular part of the day. The whole Bible will thus be read through in a family once-a-year, each part being concluded about the same time, and all the matters which it contains will have been presented and considered.

Digitized by Google

and decorum. Nor are they less dogmatic and overbearing in insisting upon their privileges than the clergy themselves.—Hence in some congregations there is no subordination whatever, no correct discipline, no rule—every one doing that which is right in his own eyes, as in the days when Israel had no king.—They even oppose the appointment of elders, asserting that the office has ceased, as though our Lord could appear as the CHIEF *shepherd*, without having UNDER-*shepherds*. These churches accordingly are not only independent of every other church, but every member in them is independent of every other member. But Christianity has as little toleration for democracy and anarchy, as it has for tyranny and usurpation. God is not the author of confusion, but of order; and as there can be no order without rule, so there can be no rule without subordination. And since the Christian church should be a model of perfect order and decorum; there should exist in it the most perfect subordinacy. If this lesson were learned, elders might then exercise their office of ruling, and certainly nothing is more needed by many of the churches than "elders who rule well." The truth is that men are so busy taking care of their bodies, that they have no time to take care of their souls, and need somebody to do it for them. Hence while human nature continues the same, that office is imperatively needed, whose most important function is to watch over the spiritual interests of the congregation. But some flocks again cannot keep a faithful shepherd who will thus devote his attention to them—because, either for want of being regularly milked or from being in poor pasture, they have gone entirely dry.

For all these deficiencies I would blame some of the churches which have fallen under my observation, if blaming would do any good. But blaming does no good to any one. I would therefore adopt the language used in such a case by Paul, who was an excellent judge of human nature, and merely say, 'For these things I *praise* them *not*.'

I am happy, however, that there are many things for which the brethren in Kentucky deserve the highest commendation.—It is delightful to witness the warmth of feeling, the zeal, and animation manifested by them at their meetings. Religion is with

Digitized by Google

them no cold abstract speculation, but something which commands the warmest emotions of the heart. Their sociality, kindness to strangers, and unbounded hospitality are also remarkable and are well known. These amiable traits, indeed, seem to belong in common to the whole community in Kentucky, and on this account the country, beautiful and fertile as it is in most of the parts which I visited, presents to the eye of the stranger a still more attractive appearance. How beautiful and excellent a *portress* is Hospitality! In accordance with her office of opening the door to the stranger upon earth, she opens also the bright portals of heaven and admits the righteous to the joys of their Lord!

Our brethren in Kentucky deserve also much credit for their generosity and liberality. Great attention is paid here to the subject of education, and they are at present much interested in the support of Georgetown College as an Institution free from the trammels and influences of sectarianism. From the high character of those who were chiefly instrumental in founding this College, and their evident determination to make it in all respects worthy of public confidence, I doubt not it will prove a blessing to the community. The Professors spare no pains in promoting the interests of the pupils in their various departments, and every exertion is made to enlarge the library and apparatus. It certainly deserves to be sustained by all who are friendly to moral and intellectual improvement.

To close my ramblings for the present—After passing through Stanford from Crab Orchard, I continued my journey southward through a waste and barren country, almost entirely uninhabited, where the timid deer may be seen crossing the traveller's path, to Columbia in Adair county. Here I had the pleasure of forming an acquaintance with the brothers Caldwell and other intelligent members of the church in that place. Returning thence through Stanford and Lancaster, I spent some days with the church at Nicholasville; and, after attending a three days meeting held at Versailles, proceeded without delay through Lexington, Georgetown, and Paris, to Maysville. Embarking here on the steamer Munroe, I reached Bethany on the 18th August, and had the happiness to find that my family and friends

Digitized by Google

had been preserved in health by the same kind Providence by which I had myself been guided. And now, after all, I do not know but that the pleasure of meeting again with those we love is a full compensation for the pains of absence; so wisely ordered is our lot, that fatigue prepares us to enjoy the sweets of repose, and even the falling tears of sorrow cause the flowers of joy to bloom.———Yours ever,

R. R.

OPINIONISM—*No. III.*

To draw out in still bolder attitudes the difference between Faith and Opinion, we shall make some scriptural selections on subjects upon which we have both faith and opinion. We shall begin with the resurrection of the dead:—

1. As to the *author* and *finisher* of the resurrection, we *believe* that Jesus Christ our Redeemer shall raise the dead at his appearing and his kingdom. The testimony which we believe on this subject is as follows:—"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though this body be destroyed, yet after I awake, in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold, and not a stranger. In earnest desire for that day, my reins within my bosom are consumed." Job xix. 25, 26, 27. This is the best translation of this obscure passage which we can form. This only proves the appearance of the Saviour on the occasion of the resurrection. "O Israel! I will be thy king; I will ransom them from the power [hand] of the grave. I will redeem them from death. O Death, I will be thy plagues. O Grave! I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from my eyes." Hosea xiii. 10—14. "At that time shall Michael stand up——and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake—some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 12. These are Old Testament sayings, and, of course, neither so luminous nor so definite as the following from the New:—

Jesus said, "I am the resurrection and the life." John xi. 25. "And this is the Father's will—that, of all that he has given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life, and *I will raise him up* at the last day." John vi. 39, 40. And again, verse 44, "*I will raise him up* the

Digitized by Google

last day." The testimony is abundantly full and strong to warrant the highest moral certainty that Jesus will raise the dead; that "as by a man [Adam] came death, by a man [Jesus] comes also the resurrection from the dead: for as by Adam all die, so by Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. It is indeed true that God himself by Jesus raises the dead; for he that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken the mortal bodies of his saints. Rom. viii. 11. "He shall change our humbled bodies that they may be fashioned like his glorious body, according to the working by which he is able to subdue all things to himself." Phil. iii. 21.

2. As to *the persons* to be raised by the Lord, we believe that all the dead, small and great, just and unjust, good and bad, shall be raised to life or condemnation, Testimony: "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." John v. 29. Here are two resurrections clearly announced. Paul also is a clear and definite witness upon this same point. Before Felix, in his speech, he avers as follows: "I have hope towards God, which they themselves [the Jews] also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust." Acts xxiv. 15. It is unnecessary, after these two witnesses, to quote the parable of the sheep and the goats, in which it is declared that "*all nations*" shall stand before the Judge of *the living* and of *the dead*, and be judged by him; or to read from the visions of John, who saw all the dead, both small and great, stand before him that sat upon the great white throne. Matth. xxv. 32—46. Rev. xx. 12, 13. "The sea, death, and hades delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were *every man* judged according to his works." The universality of the resurrection and future judgment is as fully asserted and may be as firmly believed as that Jesus is the Christ. If any one wish for more evidence on this subject, let him read Rom. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12. and 2 Cor. v. 10, 11. with many similar passages. There is nothing future more clearly or fully revealed than the resurrection and future judgment of *every man*.

3. As to *what is to be raised* from the grave, we believe, that, as it was when Christ rose, so shall it be when he comes—that only *the bodies of the dead* shall come out of the graves. Testimony: "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of the graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared to many." Matt. xxvii. 52. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make alive or quicken your mortal bodies." "The earnest expectation of the [ktisis] creature [or mortal body] waiteth for the

Digitized by Google

manifestation of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that subjected it in hope, that the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. We groan within ourselves, waiting the adoption, to wit—THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY; for we are saved by hope:" "For God has predestined us to be conformed to the image of his Son." Rom. viii. 11—29. "Who shall change our vile or corrupted *bodies*, that they may be fashioned after his most glorious body." Phil. iii. 21. "We know that we shall be like him." John iii. 1—3. In answer to the question, "With what body do they come out of the grave?" Paul answers, "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown an animal body, it is raised a spiritual body."—"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—"The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and the living shall be changed (into incorruptibility;) for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal (body) must put on immortality!" 1 Cor xv. 42—54. "In this tabernacle (or body) we groan, (waiting for the redemption of the body,) earnestly desiring to be clothed upon (covered) with our heavenly (house) (spiritual body.")—We groan not for being divested of our earthly bodies, but for being invested with our heavenly house, "that the mortal body* might be swallowed up of life." "We are indeed willing to be absent from the body to be present with the Lord," &c. 2 Cor. v. 1—8. It ought to be remarked that it is a very common usage in language to call the body the person, and to speak of the body as if it were the whole person of man. In this usage the scriptures abound, as they do in every other common and natural usage of language. Sir Isaac Newton and all other astronomers of his time daily spoke of the sun rising and setting—of the ascending and descending of the fixed stars as the common people spoke of them, though it was positively contrary to their own knowledge and teaching that any of these suns ever rose or set. So the Lord himself and the Apostles speak of saints sleeping, awaking, dying, rising—of the dead hearing the voice of the Son of God, coming forth, &c. &c. in accordance with the appearance of things and the common usage of mankind. But when they speak without figure and definitely, they always represent the body only, and never the spirit of man, as the subject of mortality, of death, and of a resurrection. Thus in the above instances are found the most unequivocal evidences that

* *To thneeton* This word is only used Rom. vi. 12,. viii. 10. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. 2 Cor. iv. 11. The life of Jesus might be manifested in our mortal flesh; and in this place again without a noun. "that the mortal flesh or body, our mortality, might be swallowed up by life," as "death will be swallowed up by victory." 1 Cor. xv. 54.

Digitized by Google

the bodies of men are the subjects of this wonderful demonstration of almighty power; and that in no case is the soul mentioned as participating in the resurrection of the body, or as coming out of the grave. We therefore believe in the resurrection of the body, but not in the resurrection of the soul: of the former abundant testimony is given, but not a word is said about the latter.

4. As to *the time when the dead shall be raised*, we believe that it shall be on the last day of all time, and yet before the bodies of the living saints shall be changed into incorruption, or be clothed upon with the spiritual and heavenly mansion. Testimony: "I will raise him up at *the last day*," three times asserted by our Lord, John vi. 39, 40, 44. Martha, one of the Saviour's pupils, when he told her, "Thy brother Lazarus shall rise again," replied to him, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." John xi. 24. "For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not anticipate them that are asleep: for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air, and so we shall be ever with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15—17. "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we the living shall be changed." 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. We are assured then that the dead will be raised the last day, before the living shall be changed, and that the raised saints and the metamorphosed saints shall together meet the Lord in the air, and be forever with him.

To sum up the testimony and our faith on this subject as far as we have quoted the sacred vouchers under the preceding four points: We *believe* that Jesus Christ will personally appear on the last day, and at his descent there will be a shout, even the voice of the archangel and of the trump of God, which shall awaken all the dead, just and unjust, small and great; all that are in the earth or sea shall then arise. The living saints shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and the raised saints in company with them shall be separated from the wicked, caught up *together* to meet the Lord, acquitted before the universe, and admitted in glorified bodies into the presence of God himself; while the wicked, clothed with shame and everlasting contempt, shall be banished into a region prepared for the devil and his angels, where they shall suffer an everlasting banishment from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.

Digitized by Google

So far we believe. Now for the chapters of opinions, of which there are two, viz.—opinions not subversive of the faith, and opinions at war with it. A few samples of each shall be given.

CHAPTER I.

Opinions not subversive of the Faith.

I am of opinion, says the speculative Christian, that the Lord will appear first in the East, over the Mount from which he ascended, surrounded by chariots of fire and innumerable hosts of angels.

2. That the archangel, the prince of all the celestial hosts, carrying a trumpet of immense extent, reaching the whole apparent distance from the sun to the morning star, shall put it to his mouth soon as the Lord approaches the earth; and at that instant a blast shall shake heaven and earth, pierce through the whole terraqueous globe, and move every atom from the centre of our planet to its circumference; at which all the dead bodies shall be reanimate in the twinkling of an eye.

3. While the righteous bodies come forth from their graves, of a dazzling brightness, resplendent as was the Messiah on the Mount; the bodies of the wicked appear dark as Erebus. But as the blackest and most opaque glass is of as permanent a composition as the purest and the fairest crystal, so the bodies of wicked men shall be as durable as those of the saints, as susceptible of enduring eternal punishment as the bodies of the righteous shall be of eternal bliss.

4. The deformity and hideousness of the wicked shall consist in their assimilation to Satan; and in the exact ratio of their conformity to him in this life, will be their likeness to him in the resurrection of damnation: for as the bodies of the righteous, crystalized, beaming with a heavenly beauty, more richly brilliant than the costliest of earthly gems, admirably suited to the sapphire courts of heaven, shall resemble their divine and heavenly model, so must the children of the wicked one resemble that hideous and frightful monster to whom they devoted their earthly being, and in whose service their years were spent.

5. As all the masses of the solar universe have the power of self-preservation by continually feasting upon themselves; so the wicked shall be so changed in body as to live forever upon their own self-reproaches and the remembrance of their misdeeds and wanton abuse of Heaven's bounties to them.

CHAPTER II.

Opinions directly or indirectly subversive of the Faith of the Scripture Testimony of the Resurrection.

1. The matter of which the whole man is compounded being taken from the earth, must return to the earth; and therefore the whole man

Digitized by Google

is dissolved at death; and when all the elements of nature receive from him all that they gave to him, nothing remains. When his person is entirely decomposed, and he has paid all his debts to the gaseous, the liquid, and the solid forms of the universe and all the simple substances, he has nothing for himself. Himself is annihilated, as it is the only thing can be. There is now nothing to sleep—nothing to awaken.

2. His resurrection will be a new creation. I should not say *his*, for *his* has no being; but it shall be out of the same old elements newly arranged and crystalized into immortality.

3. He had formed a *character*, which has been preserved somewhere during the interval between death and the resurrection, and which is reassumed by the newly created person; and as soon as the character is combined with the resurrection body, consciousness awakes from the combination, and the person feels himself the same that he was when he fell asleep: the first idea that he has being the last idea of which he was conscious on going to rest.

4. The subject of this character is the mind; but depending as it did for its being upon mere organization, it necessarily passeth away into empty space on the disorganization of the animal temple, while the character marvellously filleth the separate state till the resurrection morn.

5. The common notion of spirits separated from their bodies, having a conscious existence from death to the resurrection, is most unphilosophic; but that the moral character should exist in a separate state from body, soul, and spirit, is quite supposable, from the doctrine of rational necessity; inasmuch as if body, soul, spirit, and character, were all to be dissolved, there would be nothing to be judged, nothing to be honored or dishonored.

6. Something must then exist separate from the body; and as that is neither soul nor spirit, it must be the character; so that hades is filled with *characters*, not with spirits; and at the resurrection or new creation there will be a union of characters to the bodies raised out of the same old elements; and this is figuratively called awaking out of sleep.

7. Still this sleep is but a figure, and not a very exact figure: for in natural sleep the body is still animate, and no disorganization or separation ensues; while in the sleep of death, there is a thorough decomposition and disorganization of the whole mass, except the character, which forever adheres to itself, and is capable of continuance.

This character is like a germ, which will have a singular power of accretion, or of attracting to itself whatever of the old constitution is homogeneous with itself. Thus the germs of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David are still lying in some otherwise empty space, called *hades;*

Digitized by Google

and, at the resurrection, these germs will attract out of the mortal remains of the bodies of these patriarchs whatever will be consonant to themselves; and this, purified from all the dross and refined like silver, will become immortal and eternal, &c. &c. &c.

We have not room for a greater variety at present. None of these opinions of the first or second chapter are of any sanctifying tendency; neither the innocent nor the noxious. But as few minds can exactly trace where their opinions begin to contradict faith, we may learn that infinite modesty becomes the assertion of them; and that a dogmatist is no very pleasant nor safe companion, being always cousin-german at least to the schismatic. We hope to continue this subject in our next volume. A C.

A VISION OF THE PAST.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 290, AND CONCLUDED.]

THE AGAPA, OR LOVE-FEAST.

Upon knocking, the door was opened by a lad in a loose robe, who, respectfully saluting Cleopas and his companion, led the way through a passage furnished with benches on each side, into an open court which was paved with blue marble, and surrounded by a cloister or piazza which served to protect the ranges of apartments by which this open court was entirely enclosed. Crossing to the side opposite to that by which we entered, we approached the door of one of these apartments, which was thrown open, and Cleopas, pronouncing a benediction as he entered, was warmly greeted by a large company who rose to receive him. While they interchanged their affectionate salutations, I had leisure to survey the scene before me. The room was spacious, and was hung from the middle of the wall downwards with light green hangings, the upper part being embellished with carved work of various device. The ceiling was of wainscot, thrown into a variety of pannels artfully painted. The floor was of tiles and covered with carpets, and along the sides of the wall was a range of narrow beds or mattrasses upon which the guests had been seated at our entrance. At the upper end of the room was a small gallery raised about three feet from the floor, with a balustrade in front, and steps leading up to it. In this was placed a bed. A large lamp, fixed upon a stand, illuminated the whole apartment, so as to render every object distinctly visible.* Some of

* Matthew v. 15.

Digitized by Google

the persons present seemed to be the same that I had seen at the prayer-meeting, but their countenances were more joyful, and their whole appearance expressive of the highest degree of happiness, while their conversation was intermingled with ejaculations of praise to God who had granted their petitions for the deliverance of Peter.

"That tall man in the prime of life," whispered my companion, "whom you perceive engaged in earnest conversation with Agenor to whom he has just been introduced, is Barnabas. He too is a native of Cyprus.* In the general distribution of property at the beginning, he was one of the first to sell his possessions and lay the money at the Apostles' feet.† He was the means also of introducing Paul to the rest of the Apostles,‡ and is much attached to him, having been brought up with him at the feet of Gamaliel ‖ That more elderly person whom you see attending to the comfort of the guests, is Mnason. He was converted by Christ himself, and was one of the seventy sent forth by him.§ This is the night on which the Jews eat the passover, and to-morrow is the day appointed by Herod to bring forth Peter for execution in the presence of the multitude.¶ You perceive the joy of the disciples at his rescue. They are about to partake of a love-feast, and to celebrate the Lord's supper"——

As he spoke, two long and narrow tables were placed in the midst of the room, some distance apart, and opposite to each other, while a third was set down at right angles with them, and close to them, so as to connect their ends together, nearly in the form of the letter U. Close to these tables upon the outside were placed three couches formed of quilted mattrasses, with cushions.** The table being covered with various simple dishes, amongst which I noticed pickles, sallads, broths, and small basons of unleavened bread, together with cups of wine, one of the company advancing, lifted up his hands toward heaven and poured forth a fervent thanksgiving; at the close of which each one audibly pronounced *Amen!* Placing themselves then upon the couches, they reclined in such a manner that resting the left elbow upon the cushions, the right arm was left free for use, while the feet extended to the outer edge of the bed.†† Thus situated, they proceeded at the

---

* Acts iv. 36. † Id. Ibid. ‡ Id. ix. 27. ‖ Calmet, p. 153. § Id. 649. Acts xxi. 16. ¶ Acts xii. 3, 4, 11. It was a singular blunder of King James' translators that they used the term Easter in this passage to signify *passover*. Easter is of Saxon derivation, from the name of the goddess Æstert or Æaster to whom the Saxons offered sacrifices every spring about the season of the passover among the Jews It has come, by an association of ideas, to be applied to the festival commemorative of the resurrection of Christ, which happened about the time of the passover. ** Each of these couches was called a *clinium* by the Latins. Three tables and couches thus arranged, so as to form but one, were called a *triclinium*. Their mattrasses were stuffed with cotton or other soft substance. They were light and easily carried about. The paralytic was therefore commanded to "take up his bed," i. e. his *mattrass* Mark ii 4, 11. They could also be washed. Mark vii. 4. *margin*. †† Id. ib. Brown's Antiq. vol 2. page 211. Matth. xxvi. 23.

Digitized by Google

invitations of Mnason to partake of the dishes before them, using the thumb and two first fingers of the right hand to convey the food to the mouth, and dipping their bread into the broth or pottage.

From the position in which they recline at meat, said I to my guide, I can readily understand why the penitent woman in the house of the Pharisee is represented as standing at Jesus' feet *behind him*, as she washed them with tears and wiped them with her hair.* I perceive also how Jesus himself could approach the disciples' feet to wash them, as they were at table.

"It is not," observed he, "their constant custom to recline in this manner. At ordinary meals they sit erect upon the edge of the divan upon which the repast is spread, or more commonly with their legs folded under them. This mode of reclining is adopted by the Jews at the paschal supper, as a mark of freedom, for servants or slaves (such as they once were in Egypt) commonly ate standing.† The Christians retain the custom at their social meals. The Jews," added he, "were wont to drink each four cups of wine during the eating of the passover, and it was the last of these‡ which Christ consecrated as the memorial of his blood, and gave to his disciples, after which they sung the conclusion of the *hallel* or hallelujah psalms,‖ and repaired to Olivet.—Nothing was said of wine in the original institution of the paschal supper, but it was judged proper to be used in commemorating so great a deliverance. The Christians continue to use it, as you perceive, at their love-feasts."§

In the mean time the conversation at the table became animated, and I could discover that the divine character of Christ, the love of God, and the salvation of men were the engrossing subjects.

"As we formerly reclined at the feast of the passover as a mark of freedom from Egyptian bondage," said a young man at the foot of the table, to one about his own age upon whose bosom he leaned, "with how much more reason may we adopt the custom upon this night, seeing that Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, and we have been delivered from a far more grievous servitude."

---

* Luke vii. 38. † Hence Maimonides observes: "How different is this night from all other nights! for on all other nights we eat either sitting or reclining at pleasure, but this night we all eat reclining." ‡ Brown's Antiquities, vol. 1. page 417. ‖ From the 113th to 119th Psalm. § Tertullian speaks of them thus: "Nothing low or unseemly is committed in them; nor is it till after having prayed to God that they sit down to table:—Food is taken in moderation as wanted, and no more is drank than it becomes discreet persons to drink. Each takes such refreshment as is suitable, in connexion with the recollection that he is to be engaged, in the course of the night, in adorations to God; and the conversation is conducted as becometh those who know that the Lord heareth them.—After water has been brought for the hands, and fresh lights, every one is invited to sing, and to glorify God, whether by passages from the Sacred Scriptures, or of his own composition. This discovers whether proper moderation has been observed at the table. In short, the repast concludes as it began, that is to say, with prayer." Apol. cap. 39. See 1 Cor. xi 17—22. Jude, ver. 12.

Digitized by Google

"Yes, truly," replied the person addressed, "blessed be the name of the Lord! Upon this night our wine also is unmixed with water as one might say, our joy is complete."

"It does not need," rejoined the first speaker, "to be cooled by the snow of Libanus. The remembrances of redeeming love give to it a higher zest. And how blessed will be that period when we shall be permitted to drink of the fruit of the vine with our Lord himself in his Father's kingdom!"*

The repast being ended, basins of water were carried round, in which the company washed their hands; while others removed the viands and placed upon the table a loaf of unleavened bread and a cup of wine — This being done, and all having resumed their places, the conversation became more general, and took a more serious turn. The exceeding sinfulness of sin; the long-suffering and goodness of God; his immaculate purity and holiness; his inviolate justice, his love in the sacrifice of his Son, were alternately the theme, and as they dwelt upon the death of Christ and recalled the remembrance of his sufferings, a solemn feeling of awe, blended with love and pity, pervaded the whole assembly, while some were unable to restrain their tears.

At this moment Agenor who was evidently much affected, addressed a few words to Cleopas, who immediately announced that his young friend, having become fully convinced that Jesus was the Messiah, desired to be admitted to baptism.† At this declaration, they embraced him with tears of joy, and gave glory to God who sent his Son to save sinners.

In the midst of their rejoicing, I heard a loud knocking at the door, and could distinguish the sound of voices, while the whole edifice appeared to be shaken. At first I conjectured that there was a violent assault of the Jews upon the house of Mnason, when suddenly the whole scene vanished from before me, and waking up, I found myself in my own apartment, and my friend E. shaking me by the arm.

"Ah!" said he, "are you dreaming with your eyes open?"

I know not, replied I, but if you had not awakened me, I should soon have witnessed the manner in which the ancient Christians baptized their converts, about which there has been so much contention. Ah! how different are their feelings, conversations, and actions, from what we see in modern days.

"Well," rejoined he, "and do you think that people would believe your testimony respecting baptism when they will not believe even the scriptures upon that subject?‡ Or do you think that the religious world

* Matth. xxvi 29. † Mark xvi. 16; Acts viii. 36, 37.
‡ John iii. 23; Romans vi. 4; Colossians ii. 12.

Digitized by Google

will be any better in their behaviour, or will reform from their selfishness, sectarianism, and worldly-mindedness by persuasion? Rest assured that they will seek the things of the world as long as these can be obtained, and that nothing but the flames of persecution will consume the rank weeds by which the Christian profession is at present choked. It is when the present world is placed beyond their reach that men place a higher estimate upon that which is to come. By the bye, I will just read to you, in reference to this point, a passage which I met with lately in a German writer who gives us a dialogue between a pilgrim and one of the primitive Christians. In reply to a query respecting the effect of the early persecutions, the latter proceeds as follows:—

"*C.* Son, I have lived in several persecutions; I have also seen intervals of quiet; and what was the consequence? The humility, the devotion, the mortification to this world, which persecutions produced in us! We lived by moderate labor; our food, drink, and clothing were plain and simple, and thatched huts our dwellings, as became those who professed themselves pilgrims on earth. There was no hoarding up of worldly substance; every one distributed his surplus among the poor; we kept open table with a cordial cheerfulness; we had our private meetings in woods, and sequestered pits and caverns; to be present at which we grudged no fatigue, rejoicing to see each other's face. Barns and lofts were more pleasing to us than all the magnificence of Solomon's Temple. Oh! the sweet offices of devotion which were celebrated, the heavenly raptures which swelled our hearts in those squalid places! Thither, in their white vestments, emblems of their purity, came our Pastors to comfort and instruct their flocks; and if any strangers felt the divine impulse, and desired to be incorporated with us by baptism, what tears of joy, what ecstacy, what love were seen throughout the whole society! All the powers of our souls had shaken off every worldly shackle and incumbrance; we stood in habitual readiness, as it were, with our wings stretched out to take our flight to heaven. Many have I myself known who longed for their execution, as the blessed instant when delivered from this world of sin and sorrow, they should be transported to the converse of our beloved bridegroom Jesus Christ, that neither fire, sword, nor wild beasts could intimidate them. What do I say?—Intimidate! they were rather more stimulated to face those instruments of death and torture. Indeed to them they are only cathartic medicines against the corruptions of nature; and which so far from answering the scope of our enemies, augment the number of Christians.

"*Pilgrim.*—This was an attachment and ardor of which mere human nature seems scarcely capable; I hope it did not cool in times of freedom.

"*C.*—Alas! no sooner were the persecutions discontinued and edicts published allowing Christians the unmolested exercise of their religion, than this intenseness began to relax. Security gave rise to projects. One betook himself to trade; another bought a field which he converted into an orchard; another turned farmer, and all eager to enlarge their dealings and add house to house; others gave themselves up to other occupations—all alike slaves to the things here below.

Digitized by Google

Then, instead of devotion and heavenly-mindedness, their thoughts began to turn on the elegancies of life. How much was required to support such a manner of living! Then fortunes were to be provided for their children that they might live like themselves. In short, the mind became polluted, perplexed, and encumbered. If by the indulgence our assemblies were more crowded, a strange coldness, inattention, and even some levity were remarked: it was but too plain that many came rather out of form and custom than from any thing of a devout disposition; and brotherly love, for which we were remarkable, began to cool. They who before rejoiced to relieve the poor brethren, closed their hands; their love of money was more prevalent in them than the love of souls; gain was preferred to godliness, and poverty became a reproach: in short, the universal aim was to be rich; yet fatal to many did riches prove, exposing them to the enticements of the world. Christians began to court the favor of the great—to solicit for employments—to affect the fashions—to build fine houses—to vary their dress—to give entertainments—to hate, to envy, to wish, to hope, to fear; and all about these perishable things of sense, which in times of persecution we did not esteem worth a serious thought. They who before took joyfully the spoiling of their goods, would now have risked, or, at least, have made use of any artifice or prevarication to save them. Humility, poverty of spirit, and patience, without which all religion withers or is vain, were thrown aside. You must think, son, what a detriment this was to our holy assemblies, by the listlessness, the dissipation, the self-love, the affectation of superiority, the contests which spread among us. Pliny, who ventured to write to the emperor Trajan, in favor of the Christians, observing this degeneracy, advised him to indulge them in their full liberty, and then they would fall away of their own accord! A deep-fetched counsel! For certainly there is no poison so dangerous to incautious man as ease, luxury, and a full fruition of this world."

What a melancholy picture, I exclaimed. And I cannot deny that it is in a great measure just. Nevertheless, there were true Christians in these prosperous times—many no doubt who possessed the fine gold of the sanctuary, though I grant you that its beauty, brightness, and value were not so conspicuous as when it was proved by fiery trials.—True faith is like the diamond which is valuable in its primitive state, though it can be distinguished from the worthless pebble only by the skilful lapidary; it is after it is cut and polished that its superior brilliancy becomes evident to all. If, then, the gospel were preached now as it was in the days of the Apostles, and the truth received in love and from the heart, it would yet manifest at least its utility and its milder graces and purifying influences in the conduct of those who embraced it. It would have its natural and proper effect in producing love, joy, holiness and peace, and in elevating the affections in our present condition; and when the day of persecution would come, its firmer qualities and more admired and striking attributes would be evinced, as the oak, which is ever beautiful in the season of calmness

Digitized by Google

and serenity, displays its strength only in resisting the storm and tempest which but cause it to take deeper root and flourish with greater vigor. L.

ANY CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS?

Judging from numerous letters received at this office, my reply to the sister from Lunenburg has given some pain to our brethren, and some pleasure to our sectarian friends. The builders up of the parties tauntingly say to our brethren, "Then we are as safe as you," and "You are coming over to us, having now conceded the greatest of all points—viz. that immersion is not essential to a Christian." Some of our brethren seem to think that we have neutralized much that has been said on the importance of baptism for remission, and disarmed them of much of their artillery against the ignorance, error, and indifference of the times upon the whole subject of Christian duty and Christian privilege.

My views of Opinionism forbid me to dogmatize or to labor to establish my own opinion, and therefore I hope to be excused for not publishing a hundred letters for and against said opinion. Only one point of importance would be gained by publishing such a correspondence; and I almost regret that we have not a volume to spare for it. It would indeed fully open the eyes of the community to the fact that there are but few "Campbellites" in the country. Too many of my correspondents, however, seem to me to have written rather to show that they are not "Campbellites," than to show that my opinion is false and unfounded.

While, then, I have no wish to dogmatize, and feel no obligation to contend for the opinion itself, I judge myself in duty bound to attempt—

1st. To defend myself from the charge of inconsistency.

2d. To defend the opinion from the sectarian application of it.

3d. To offer some reasons for delivering such an opinion at this time.

I. With all despatch, then, I hasten to show that I have neither conceded nor surrendered any thing for which I ever contended; but that, on the contrary, the opinion now expressed, whether true or false, is one that I have always avowed.*

1. Let me ask, in the first place, what could mean all that we have written upon the union of Christians on apostolic grounds, had we taught that all Christians in the world were already united in our own community?

2. And in the second place, why should we so often have quoted and applied to apostate Christendom what the Spirit saith to saints in Babylon—"Come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues"—had we imagined that the Lord had no people beyond the pale of our communion!

3. But let him that yet doubts, read the following passages from the

* It is with us as old as baptism for the remission of sins, and this is at least as old as the "Christian Baptist." Read the first two numbers of that work.

Digitized by Google

Christian Baptist, April, 1825:—"I have no idea of seeing, nor wish to see, the sects unite in one grand army. This would be dangerous to our liberties and laws. For this the Saviour did not pray. It is only the disciples dispersed among them that reason and benevolence would call out of them," &c. &c. This looks very like our present opinion of Christians among the sects!!! 2d ed. Bethany, p. 85.

4. Again, speaking of purity of speech in order to the union of Christians, we say, "None of you [Christians] have ever yet attempted to show how Christians can be united on your principles. You have often showed how they may be divided, and how *each party may hold it's own;* but while you *pray* for the visible unity of the disciples, and advocate their visible disunity, we cannot understand you." March, 1827, vol. 4.

5. Various essays and letters on "Christian union" from our correspondents, are given to our readers with our approbation; from one of which we quote these words:—"I suppose all agree that among Christians of every name there are disciples of Jesus Christ, accepted of God in him, real members of his body, branches in the true vine, and therefore all one in Christ." October, 1826, vol. 4, p. 53.

6. In a letter to Spencer Clack, August, 1826, I have said, "As to what you say concerning the evils of division among Christians, I have nothing to object. I sincerely deplore every division, and every sectarian feeling which now exists; and if I thought there was any man on this continent who would go farther than I to heal all divisions and to *unite all Christians* on constitutional grounds, I would travel on foot a hundred miles to see him and confess my faults to him" vol. 5, p. 15.

7. On the evening before my departure to debate with Mr. Owen, vol. 6, p. 239, April 6, 1829, in alluding to that crisis, I say—"I rejoice to know and feel that I have the good wishes, the prayers, and the hopes of myriads of Christians in all denominations." So speak the pages of the Christian Baptist on many occasions.*

8. The views of the Millennial Harbinger on this subject are condensed in a work called "Christianity Restored," or, as we have designated it, "A Connected View of the Principles," &c. "of the Foundation on which *all Christians may form one communion.*" (See its title-page!!)

In that volume there is a long article on *the foundation of Christian union*, showing how the Christians among the sects may be united. We refer to the whole of this article from page 101 to 128, as the most unequivocal proof of our views of Christians among the sects. Indeed we say (page 102) of our own community, that it is a *nucleus* around which may one day congregate all the children of God. In that article we wax bolder and bolder, and ask, (page 121,) "Will sects ever cease? Will a time ever come when all disciples will unite under one Lord, in one faith, in one immersion? Will divisions ever be healed? Will strife ever cease among the saints on earth?"

10. But in the last place, in the first Extra on Baptism for Remission of Sins, we exclude from the pale of Christianity of the Pedobaptists none but such of them as "wilfully *neglect* this salvation, and who, having the opportunity to be immersed for the remission of sins, wilfully

* *Let the curious reader consult the essays on Christian Union in the Christian Baptist, so far as I have approbated them, especially my replies to an Independent Baptist.*

Digitized by Google

neglect or refuse"—"of such," indeed, but of none others, we say, "We have as little hope for them as they have for all who refuse salvation on their own terms of the gospel." 1st Extra, 1st ed. p. 53.

With these ten evidences or arguments, I now put it to the candor of those who accuse us of inconsistency or change of views, whether they have not most evidently misrepresented us. Were it necessary we could easily swell these ten into a hundred.

II. We shall now attempt to defend this opinion from the sectarian application of it:—

1. It affords them too much joy for the consolation which it brings; because it imparts no certainty of pardon or salvation to any particular unbaptized person whatsoever.

In reference to this opinion, all the unimmersed are to be ranged in two classes;—those who neither know nor care for this opinion, and those who know it and rejoice in it. It will require but a moment's reflection to perceive that those who care nothing for this opinion will not rejoice it nor abuse it; and that those who would, *for their own sake*, rejoice in it are not included in it. He that rejoices in such an opinion, for his own sake, has had the subject under consideration; and it is a thousand chances to one that he is obstinately or willingly in error on the subject; and, therefore, in the very terms of the opinion, he is precluded from any interest in it. His joy, indeed, is strong presumptive evidence against him; because it is proof that he is one-sided in his feelings, which no upright mind can be—at least such a mind as is contemplated in the opinion; for it respects only those who have not had any debate with themselves upon the subject, and have, without any examination or leaning, supposed themselves to have been baptized.

In no case, indeed, can there be the same certainty (all things else being equal) that he who was sprinkled, poured, or immersed on some other person's faith; or that he who was sprinkled or poured on his own faith, shall be saved, as there is that he that first believes and is then, on his own confession, immersed, shall be saved. In the former case, at best, we have only the fallible inference or opinion of man; while in the latter we have the sure and unerring promise of our Saviour and Judge. It cannot be too emphatically stated that he that rejoices *for his own sake*, that he may be accepted by the Lord on his infant or adult pouring or sprinkling, because of his dislike to, or prejudice against believer's immersion, gives unequivocal evidence of the want of that state of mind which is contemplated in the opinion expressed; and has proved himself to be a seeker of his own will and pleasure, rather than rejoicing in the will and pleasure of God; and for such persons we can have no favorable opinion.

2. But that the aforesaid opinion does not disarm us of our arguments against ignorance, error, and indifference, is evident; because it assumes that the person in question is acting up to the full measure of his knowledge upon the subject; and that he has not been negligent, according to his opportunities, to ascertain the will of his Master; for in the very terms of the opinion he is not justified, but self-condemned, *who only doubts*, or is not fully persuaded that his baptism is apostolic and divine.

3. To admit that there may be Christians among the sects, does not derogate from the value or importance of baptism for the remission of

Digitized by Google

sins, any more than it derogates from the superior value and excellency of the Christian Institution to admit that salvation was possible to the Jews and Patriarchs without the knowledge and experience of all the developments of the New Testament. For besides the Christian disposition, state, and character, there are the Christian privileges. Now, in our judgment, there is not on earth a person who can have as full an assurance of justification or of remission of sins, as the person who has believed, confessed his faith, and been intelligently buried and raised with the Lord; and therefore the present salvation never can be so fully enjoyed, all things else being equal, by the unimmersed as by the immersed.

4. Again, as every sect agrees, that a person immersed on a confession of his faith is truly baptized, and only a part of Christendom admits the possibility of any other action as baptism: for the sake of union among Christians, it may be easily shown to be the duty of all believers to be immersed, if for no other reason than that of honoring the divine institution and opening a way for the union and co-operation of all Christians. Besides, immersion gives a constitutional right of citizenship in the universal kingdom of Jesus; whereas with our opponents, themselves being judges, their "baptism" gives the rights of citizenship only in some provinces of that kingdom. For as far as baptism is concerned, the Greek, the Roman, the English, the Lutheran, the Calvinian, the Arminian, the Baptist communities will receive the immersed; while only a part of Christendom will acknowledge the sprinkled or the poured. Therefore, our opinion militates not against the value of baptism in any sense.

5. In the last place, to be satisfied with any thing that will just do in religion, is neither the Christian disposition nor character; and not to desire to know and do the whole will of God, places the individual out of the latitude and longitude of the opinion which we have advanced. These things being so, then we ask, wherein does the avowal of such an opinion disarm us of arguments for professor or profane, on the value of the baptism in the Christian Institution; or the importance and necessity of separating one's self from all that will not keep the commandments of Jesus; and of submitting without delay to the requisitions of the illustrious Prophet whom the Almighty Father has commanded all men to obey?

III. In the third and last place, we offer some reasons for delivering such an opinion at this time:—

1. We were solicited by a sister to explain a saying quoted from the current volume of this work, concerning finding "Christians in all Protestant parties." She proposed a list of questions, involving, as she supposed, either insuperable difficulties or strong objections to that saying; and because she well knew what answers I would have given to all her queries, I answered them not: but attended to the difficulty which I imagined she felt in the aforesaid saying.

2. But we had still more urgent reasons than the difficulties of this sister to express such an opinion:—Some of our brethren were too much addicted to denouncing the sects and representing them *en masse* as wholly aliens from the possibility of salvation—as wholly antichristian and corrupt. Now as the Lord says of Babylon, "Come out of her, *my people*," I felt constrained to rebuke them over the shoulders of

Digitized by Google

this inquisitive lady. These very zealous brethren gave countenance to the popular clamor that we make baptism a saviour, or a passport to heaven, disparaging all the private and social virtues of the professing public. Now as they were propounding opinions to others, I intended to bring them to the proper medium by propounding an opinion to them in terms as strong and as pungent as their own.

The case is this: When I see a person who would die for Christ; whose brotherly kindness, sympathy, and active benevolence know no bounds but his circumstances; whose seat in the Christian assembly is never empty; whose inward piety and devotion are attested by punctual obedience to every known duty; whose family is educated in the fear of the Lord; whose constant companion is the Bible: I say, when I see such a one ranked amongst heathen men and publicans, because he never happened to inquire, but always took it for granted that he had been scripturally baptized; and that, too, by one greatly destitute of all these public and private virtues, whose chief or exclusive recommendation is that he has been immersed, and that he holds a scriptural theory of the gospel: I feel no disposition to flatter such a one; but rather to disabuse him of his error. And while I would not lead the most excellent professor in any sect to disparage the least of all the commandments of Jesus, I would say to my immersed brother as Paul said to his Jewish brother who gloried in a system which he did not adorn: 'Sir, will not his uncircumcision, or unbaptism, be counted to him for baptism? and will he not condemn you, who, though having the literal and true baptism, yet dost transgress or neglect the statutes of your King?'

3. We have a third reason: We have been always accused of aspiring to build up and head a party, while in truth we have always been forced to occupy the ground on which we now stand. I have for one or two years past labored to annul this impression, which I know is more secretly and generally bandied about than one in a hundred of our brethren may suspect. On this account I consented the more readily to defend Protestantism; and I have, in ways more than I shall now state, endeavored to show the Protestant public that it is with the greatest reluctance we are compelled to stand aloof from them—that they are the cause of this great "schism," as they call it, and not we.

Now, with this exposition in mind, let us examine the meaning of he alleged concession. And first let me ask, What could induce us to make it at this crisis? or, I should more correctly say, to *repeat* it so strongly?

No one will say our opponents have compelled us by force of argument to make it. Themselves being judges, we have lost nothing in argument. All agree that the "concession" was uncalled for—a perfect free-will offering.

Neither can they say that we envy their standing, or would wish to occupy their ground; because, to say nothing of our having the pure original gospel institutions among us, regarding us merely as a new sect like themselves, we have no reason to wish to be with them, inasmuch as we have the best proselyting system in Christendom. Faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, with all the promises of the Christian adoption and the heavenly calling to those who thus put on Christ, is incomparably in advance of the sectarian altar and the straw—the mourning bench, the anxious seat, and all the other para-

Digitized by Google

phernalia of modern proselytism. That it is so practically, as well as theoretically, appears from the fact of its unprecedented advances upon the most discerning and devout portions of the Protestant parties. No existing party in this or the father-lands has so steadily and rapidly advanced as that now advocating the religion of the New Testament. It has been successfully plead within a few years in almost every state and territory in this great confederacy, and even in foreign countries.

All agree, for a thousand experiments prove it, that all that is wanting is a competent number of intelligent and *consistent* proclaimers, to its general, if not universal triumph, over all opposing systems. We have lost much, indeed, by the folly, hypocrisy, and wickedness of many pretenders, and by the imprudence and precipitancy of some good brethren: yet from year to year it bears up and advances with increasing prosperity, as the present season very satisfactorily attests.

Do we, then, seek to make and lead a large exclusive sect or party? Have we not the means! Why then concede any thing—even the bare possibility of salvation in any other party, if actuated by such fleshly and selfish considerations? With all these facts and reasonings fresh in our view, I ask, Is not such a concession—such a free-will offering, at such a time, the most satisfactory and unanswerable refutation that could be given to the calumny that we seek the glory of building a new sect in religion? If, then, as some of our opponents say, we have made a *new* and an *unexpected concession* in their favor, we have done it at such a time, in such circumstances, and with such prospects before us, as ought (we think) henceforth to silence their imputations and reproaches on the ground of selfish or partizan views and feelings.

Some of our fellow-laborers seem to forget that *approaches* are more in the spirit and style of the Saviour, than *reproaches*. We have proved to our entire satisfaction, that having obtained a favorable hearing, a conciliatory, meek, and benevolent attitude is not only the most comely and Christian-like, but the most successful. Many of the Protestant teachers and their communities are much better disposed to us than formerly; and I calculate the day is not far distant when many of them will unite with us. They must certainly come over to us whenever they come to the Bible alone. Baptists and Pedobaptists are daily feeling more and more the need of reform, and our views are certainly imbuing the public mind more and more every year.

But to conclude, our brethren of Eastern Virginia have been *the occasion* at least of eliciting at this time so strong an expression of our opinion; and we have now many letters from that region for one from any other quarter on the aforesaid opinion. Had not some of them greatly and unreasonably abused the sects, or countenanced, aided, and abetted them that did so, and had not a few in some other regions made Christianity to turn more upon immersion than upon *universal holiness*, in all probability I would have answered the sister from Lunenburg in the following manner and style:—

The name *Christian* is now current in four significations:—

1. The ancient primitive and apostolic import simply indicates *follower of Christ*. With a strict regard to its original and scriptural meaning, my favorite and oft-repeated definition is, *A Christian is one that habitually believes all that Christ says, and habitually does all that he bids him.*

Digitized by Google

2. But its national and very popular sense implies no more than a *professor* of Christianity. Thus we have the Christian nations, as well as the Pagan and Mahometan nations; the Christian sects as well as the sects political and philosophical.

3. But as soon as controversies arose about the ways and means of putting on Christ or of making a profession of his religion, in a new and special or appropriated sense, 'a Christian' means one who first believes that Jesus is the Christ, repents of his sins, is then immersed on confession into Christ's death, and thenceforth continues in the Christian faith and practice.

4. But there yet remains the sense in which I used the term in the obnoxious phrase first quoted by our sister of Lunenburg. As in the judgment of many, some make the profession right and live wrong; while others make the profession wrong, but live right; so they have adopted this style—"I don't know what he believes, nor how he was baptized, but I know he is a *Christian*." Thus Adam Clarke quotes some poet—

> "You different sects who all declare,
> "Lo! Christ is here, and Christ is there!
> "Your stronger proofs divinely give,
> "And *show* me where the Christians *live!*"

Now in this acceptation of the word, I think there are many, in most Protestant parties, whose errors and mistakes I hope the Lord will forgive; and although they should not enter into all the blessings of the kingdom on earth, I do fondly expect they may participate in the resurrection of the just.

The words *Jew*, *Israel*, *circumcision*, *disciple*, are used in the same manner, even in the sacred writings: "They are not all Israel that are of Israel"—"An Israelite indeed"—"The true circumcision"—"A Jew inwardly and outwardly"—"Then are you my disciples indeed," &c.

I am glad to see our brethren so jealous of a correct style—so discriminating, and so independent. They are fast advancing to the habit of calling Bible things by Bible names. They only misunderstood me as using the term in its strictest biblical import, while in the case before us I used it in its best modern acceptation.

I could as easily at first as at last have given this reply to our sister's queries; but I thought the times required something else—and I was not mistaken. I have no doubt but it will yet appear to all that I have pursued in this the more useful and salutary course.

Our Eastern brethren were indeed, I opine, hasty and precipitate enough in expressing themselves—almost indeed before they had time to hear and consider the whole matter. I wish they had been as prompt on another occasion, and I should not have been addressed on this subject by the worthy sister so often named. But we are all learning and progressing towards perfection. If any of them, and not all, wish their communications to appear in this work, accompanied with a few pertinent remarks, I am in duty bound, according to my plan, to publish some of them.

I do not indeed blame them altogether for being prompt; for I had rather be an hour too soon as half an hour too late; yet I think some resolutions which I have received, were, upon the whole, rather premature. May the Lord bless all the holy brethren, and give them understanding in all things! A. C.

Digitized by Google

"CHRISTIAN PUBLISHER."—I do hope the *Christian Publisher*, that excellent periodical, will be amply sustained in Virginia, and that it will continue to be, as it has been, a chaste, discreet, benevolent, and able advocate of the good cause in which I hope to die, and for which I desire to live.

I cannot say, at this time, when I may visit Eastern Virginia: that will depend on circumstances. Dr. *Robert Richardson* will, in all probability, spend a part of this winter in the eastern part of the state.

A. C.

THE MONTH OF OCTOBER.

I SPENT this month in attending the College of Teachers during their annual meeting in Cincinnati—in a visit to Dayton, Ohio—and in an excursion into Kentucky, in which I visited Georgetown, Versailles, and Lexington.

The meeting of the College was well attended and highly interesting.—Many subjects of high literary and moral importance to the great community of the West, were discussed in reports, lectures, and extemporaneous debates. One resolution of more than ordinary importance unanimously passed the College, viz.—'That, in the judgment of the College, the Bible should be introduced into every school, from the lowest to the highest, as a school-book; *only without denominational or sectarian comment.*' These are not the identical words; but those in *italics* were my amendment of the original resolution, which, I had the pleasure to learn from those on the opposite side of the house, was seconded by Bishop Purcell. The resolution, as thus amended, was *unanimously* adopted.—Of the proceedings of this College we may take some farther notice next volume.

We made a short tour up the Miami canal, and visited the disciples in Dayton. We were much pleased with the brethren of that church for our short acquaintance; and after delivering three discourses, we returned to Cincinnati, and immediately proceeded to Versailles. We held a three days meeting in that place. Monday was spent in conference with Mr. Styles, a Presbyterian gentleman of much reputation with his party.

This gentleman had for many months been conducting a species of crusade against "Campbellism," and laboriously haranguing the community upon its great and ruinous demerits. He had called upon the brethren in his public discourses to bring me to withstand him, and he would thoroughly demolish our foundation, expose our errors, and do many other terrible things which it would be painful to relate. I gave the gentleman the opportunity to redeem his boastful pledge in the presence of a very large, intelligent, and highly respectable assemblage—Col. Blackburn, President of the Senate of Kentucky, being called to the chair.

Digitized by Google

After various explanations and conferential speeches, alleging that he had been always on the defensive, the worthy gentleman declined sustaining his allegations against the reformation—charging, in a great measure, his calls upon me, his threats and imputations, to his peculiar temperament. For although he gave us every verbal assurance that his heart was good and honest, he stated that his temperament differed exceedingly from mine; and therefore he allowed us to infer that he was betrayed by it to use these offensive expressions. At all events, old Adam was compelled to bear all the blame of his indiscretions; and although repeatedly told that I was there to show that these allegations were false and unfounded, he would not attempt to sustain any of them.

He was indeed pleased to cancel all his former imputations, and promised giving me the right hand of fellowship if I would unequivocally express a concurrence with him in one metaphysical opinion concerning the *accompanying influence of the Spirit with the Word* in the work of conversion. I showed that such was not the issue he had formed that brought me to Versailles; and that this was not a point of controversy between myself and his community, or the Confession of Faith doctrine of "*accompanying influence.*" I only asserted that there was no sentence in the Old or New Testament that affirmed or denied it, and that therefore being a purely abstract question, I could not in compatibility with what I had written, engage in a controversy with any man upon such an abstraction.

I took occasion, however, to observe that such was not the question at issue; but that the issue which I had made with some parties, and probably with one branch of his church, was of much practical importance. I proceeded to state that the dogma of accompanying influence, whether true or false, was comparatively innocent: because it led men to the Bible and to expect no saving light or health but through the written word. But the opinion which I opposed, or the theory of physical metaphysical regeneration, or of faith or a holy principle wrought in the heart before, and without any knowledge of the Word, by the Spirit of God, I regarded as setting aside the word of God. Hence if I were to debate any opinion on divine influence, it would be the dogma of spiritual influence without the word, because that certainly made the Word of God of non-effect, and had opened the door for all the enthusiasm and fanaticism of latter times.

The gentleman replied neither his party, the Methodists, nor the Baptists taught such a doctrine, and that he did not believe it; and read from his Confession of Faith to show that it did not teach it.

I also took the same Confession and showed that it *did* teach it; but that I would settle the matter with a single question, viz.—*Did he not believe and teach that infants, even the elect infants, who die in infancy, must be regenerated in order to salvation?* HE DECLINED ANSWERING THAT

Digitized by Google

QUESTION. On which I affirmed and proved that it was the doctrine of the Confession and taught by most Protestant sects, and that I was prepared to demonstrate that this theory was really most mischievous in its tendencies. But the gentleman denying that it was his opinion, and declining to sustain his charges against the doctrine of the reformation, which he emphatically did by remaining silent when I informed him that on these points I was ready to disprove his allegata, the congregation was dismissed and every man returned to his own home.

We repaired to Lexington, and having discoursed to a large congregation in that city, we returned next morning to Georgetown, where we also delivered a discourse, and returned to Cincinnati. Thence we ascended the Ohio in company with brother W. Scott of Carthage, and P. B. Pendleton of Virginia, and safely arrived at Bethany the 24th day of October, being absent one month. A. C.

BACON COLLEGE.

THE Bacon College of Georgetown, Ky., is now in successful operation. Brother *D. S. Burnet* of Cincinnati, has been elected President of the Institution in room of brother W. Scott, resigned. He has removed to Georgetown and commenced the duties of his office.* From a catalogue of the officers and students of this institution recently published, we learn that the *Trustees* are—D. S. Burnet, President; J. T. Johnson, Vice-President; S. Hatch, Treasurer; John Curd, of Fayette; John Duncan, of Madison; Samuel Nuckolls, of Woodford; B. W. Finnel, of Scott; T. C. Flournoy, of Scott; G. W. Nuckolls, of Shelby; G. W. Williams, of Bourbon; H. M. Bledsoe, of Bourbon; Thomas Smith, of Lincoln; Asa R. Runyan, of Mason; John Bowman, of Mercer; Philip S. Fall, of Franklin; Absalom Adams, of Scott; James Challen, of Fayette: —that the *Faculty* is, Elder D. S. Burnet, President, and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Science; Elder W. Hunter. Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory; S. G. Mullins, Professor of Ancient Languages; T. F. Johnson, Professor of Mathematics, Natural Science, Civil Engineering, and Drawing; Lieut. J. Ammen, Professor of Mathematics, Natural Science, Civil Engineering and Drawing; Mordecai Yarnall, Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering; T. Vincent, Professor of Modern Languages; V. V. Baldwin, Principal Teacher in the Preparatory Department.;—and that at the close of last session the whole number of students in attendance amounted to 203! It is believed no College in the West, or perhaps in the East, has ever risen more rapidly than this new school.

* *All letters and communications will of course be henceforth addressed to D. S. Burnet at Georgetown, whence he will continue to issue his "Christian Preacher."*

Digitized by Google

Its learned and talented Faculty, its freedom from sectarian influence, and its plan of adopting its course of instruction to the genius of the age, have given it even at this early day a very high standing with the community.

I have been backward hitherto to say much about this Institution, until I could ascertain from a personal interview with its principal managers and conductors, their views and designs, their prospects and means, &c. but especially with reference to the discipline and moral culture under which the youth are to be placed who attend this College; for this, with me, now is above all other sorts of eminence. I give my vote for learning and science and for high attainments in all branches of useful knowledge, but I would not give *morality* for them all; and therefore I have resolved never to speak in favor of any literary institution, from a common school to a University, however superior their literary eminence, that does not first of all, and above all, exercise a sovereign and supreme guardianship over the morals of its students and wards, and endeavor to make *good* rather than *great* men. Colleges without this are no blessing to any country. So I think.

I was happy to learn that such is the firm determination of each of the Trustees and Faculty with whom I conversed. They have, indeed, given their pledge that the morals and moral culture of the youth shall be their paramount concern. Believing, then, that parents may safely send their sons to Georgetown as respects their moral safety; and as for literary and scientific advantages, it is already known that there is every thing which the students need. Therefore we can now say, that we hope that all who wish their sons well educated in all that is valuable in literature and science, without any hazard to their morals, will send them to Georgetown; and that our Christian brethren especially will patronize and build up an institution of inestimable value to themselves and their posterity. We shall call their attention to this subject more at large hereafter. Meanwhile the winter session is about commencing, and many new students are daily arriving from all parts of the Union. A. C.

WINANS ON OPINIONS.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, October 5th, 1837.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE read your essay on "Opinionism," current volume of the Harbinger, pp. 439 to 445, and am well pleased with much that you have said, and am glad that you have selected me as a proper object to reprove, that others may be led to fear also. Those who err should be reproved publicly, and no one should be offended at such reproof. But the elders and all such as know the truth should be examples, as well as reprovers, and teachers of babes. If it be wrong for the simple *to propagate their own opinions*, it is doubly so for the wise to do it; for by so doing they set a bad example.

Digitized by Google

I, as well as you, understand the Holy Spirit to teach the resurrection of all—the just and the unjust, the great and the small; but I do not understand him to teach that all shall be raised at the same time, or that none have ever been raised. There are none, as far as I know, who are of opinion, or who teach that both the just and the unjust will not be raised; but some suppose a class that are neither just nor unjust, great nor small. They do not say nor teach that the just and the unjust, and the great and the small will not be raised: they only say and teach that such as do not belong to either of these classes will not be raised, and they are of the opinion that there are some such. This is what I treated as an opinion. They believed all that God has said, but they think there are some that God has said nothing about. This much of it is untaught. But not more so than that the *body of Jesus was changed* just as he left the earth, or during its ascension to heaven. The Apostles have not said whether the body which they saw at sundry times after its resurrection, was a natural or a spiritual one, nor have they said that the bodies of the saints who appeared in the holy city to many, were either natural or spiritual; but they have distinctly stated that they *were seen* of many. I think that the bodies themselves, or the eyes of the people were miraculously affected, but incline to the former of these notions; while some suppose that the bodies were really natural ones, and were changed afterwards before they went to heaven. I read that some bodies which have never underwent death will be changed when the Lord comes; but it is not hinted that such as are resurrected will be changed afterwards, nor that any that have been raised were changed afterwards.

But then I would not give a fig for an opinion if I were not permitted to tell it. Besides, I like to hear the opinions of others, and compare them all with my own. But I do not like to be discarded because of my opinions, nor will I discard others because of theirs. Here lies the evil, and not in the opinions nor in the expression of them.

The two things hard to be uttered, namely, "*I have erred,*" or "*I am ignorant,*" are truly hard sentences; but they can be spoken with more ease by some than by others; and I have had to utter them more than once, as you know. They are harder sentences for the old than for the young, and full grown men men can scarcely utter them at all!

Affectionately yours, M. WINANS.

The above from brother Winans is just what we expected from a man of his good sense and decision of character. I have no room for comments. I have a thought to offer upon the Saviour's raised body, which I will offer at a more convenient season. Brother Winans and I do not differ in opinion about expressing an opinion; though we might in the expediency of broaching an opinion, especially until we have learned all the facts in the Bible. There is not a man of us sufficiently acquainted with all the facts of the Bible; and it is a shame for us to be speculating about men's opinions, while God's facts are unlearned and untaught among us. All things favoring, I intend next volume to propose a few questions about some curious facts in the corners and folds of our Family Bibles, which I fear will puzzle some of us to answer. A. C.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

We have much good news on hand, but we can only give a single extract from England, from the *Christian Messenger*, London, for Sep-

Digitized by Google

tember. We shall have to defer some valuable communications another month. I could have wished to have given a letter from brother Thomas M. Allen, of Missouri, in this number, as a model for reports for collecting information in the statistics of the Christian community. But this, too, reluctantly must lie over.

"We are happy to learn that reformation in religion is not exclusively confined to the United States of America, but that more correct views of some parts of the New Testament are penetrating the minds of many individuals in different parts of our own country. Although we hope before long to witness a greater reverence for the commandments, and ordinances of Jesus Christ, pervading the minds of multitudes of our fellow-men; yet, we are fully aware, that unless more of that charity which rejoices in the truth, without any admixture of error, be called into exercise, the entrance of light into the mind will be the cause of much unpleasant feeling and division among the present professors of religion. We ourselves are expecting to meet with much detraction of character, and the most virulent opposition to every species of ecclesiastical reform. This, however, can only arise from *misconception, prejudice,* and *sectarianism*. Our sincere desire is, that none of those who plead for the practice of divine truth as revealed in his Word, will render evil for evil, or railing for railing; but, contrarywise, blessing.

"During the last month we have received, through the medium of a letter from a brother residing in Carlisle, the pleasing intelligence that a congregation of disciples has recently been formed at New Mills, a place east of Glasgow, where nineteen persons have lately been immersed into the Ancient Faith for the remission of sins; that they are connected with six other churches who have separated themselves from ungodly professors, and who are of the same faith and order; meeting on the first day of the week to observe all that Christ has enjoined upon them.

"We shall at any time be happy to receive communications from any of our brethren there, or elsewhere, respecting the progress of reform, and promise them a small space each month in the pages of the Christian Messenger.

"We wish also to inform our readers, that on the second Lord's day in August our brother Wallis, being by previous arrangement at Huddersfield, two persons residing there were immersed for the remission of their sins; after which a meeting was held for social worship, consisting of prayer, praise, exhortation, and the Lord's supper, by eight immersed believers, six of whom reside at Huddersfield, and who have engaged to meet on every first day of the week, to obey their Lord and master Jesus Christ, until he shall call them by death to resign their stewardship into his hands. Our desire is, that *union, peace,* and *prosperity* may attend all their efforts to benefit their fellow-men, and that they may, indeed, both in their personal and collective capacity, "shine as lights in the world, holding forth the Word of Life."

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

It is now the 22d of November, and up to this evening I have not heard from Mr. Skinner in reply to my last written in September. Our readers need not to be informed what pains I have taken to have a letter from each party in every number. My two last letters were written in anticipation

Digitized by Google

of Mr. Skinner, that time might not be lost in consequence of my absence from home during September and October. Whether Mr. S. has gone to attend a convention or to find a substitute, I do not affirm. Perhaps his indisposition which we have heard calls him to the South, might make it expedient to put it into the hands of Mr. Balfour. I will not object should circumstances so require. He certainly will not think of keeping us waiting till our sheet reach Richmond and his answers be written there and mailed to Utica, New York, to be printed and thence mailed to Bethany, Virginia! But that is not all; he cannot issue one of my letters to his readers in his weekly paper till he sends along with it his reply: so that his reply must again occasionally wait till the compositor has set up my letter, or till the weekly is almost ready to be issued. These are rare facilities in this day of despatch, and an instructive comment on his proposition of dividing into smaller divisions than two numbers our monthly correspondence, as proposed in his letter of arrangments of December last. This proposed division for despatch, it will be recollected, was made to obviate my objections to the delay of a monthly replication! We shall be glad to know whether we must wait for such a circuit. We do not think that it is in accordance with the true interpretation of our covenant.

A. C.

CHRISTIAN PREACHER.

The *Christian Preacher* is henceforth to be issued at Georgetown, Ky. Brethren J. T. Johnson and D. S. Burnet are henceforth to be the conductors of this valuable monthly. Communications for and concerning said periodical, to be addressed to J. T. Johnson, Esq. at Georgetown, Scott county, Ky.

J. H. LAMPHEAR.

Brother Shepard, of the "Primitive Christian," New York, has published *J. H. Lamphear*, now in Portage county, Ohio, as a polygamist and unworthy of the name of a Christian. He is from all accounts, certainly unworthy the confidence of the Christian community as a *teacher* of religion. I trust I shall not be sued for this notice, as in the case of W. W. Sleigh. Impostors must be exposed and Christians protected from wolves in the garb of sheep, at all risks and perils. A. C.

☞ "R. L." in our next.

Digitized by Google

EXTRA, No. I.——NEW SERIES.

BETHANY, VA. DECEMBER, 1837.

To all those brethren in Virginia and elsewhere, who have either in their individual or social relations addressed me on the meaning and tendency of an opinion expressed in reply to some queries from a sister in Lunenburg, Va., the following pages (though on another subject) are very respectfully and affectionately inscribed—by their fellow-citizen in the present kingdom of the Messiah, A. CAMPBELL.

All bodies, natural, political, and religious, are subject to various diseases and calamities. They are so in every period of their existence; but more especially when their growth is rapid and their system plethoric.

All diseases, however, are not mortal. Unpleasant though they all are, many of them are remedial and salutary. Fevers, biles, and ulcers have saved many a life; for whatever is feculent or deleterious in any system must finally destroy it or be destroyed.

Religious communities are of very delicate constitutions, and consequently subject to frequent attacks of disease. Sometimes, indeed, the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint, and from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot it is one corrupt mass of wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores. In such cases medicine is wholly unavailing. At other times there is only a slight indisposition; but in this unfriendly climate slight indispositions in the Christian body often suddenly progress to serious maladies. Hence it is of importance that the first indications be immediately attended to, and that salutary remedies be timously administered.

An important crisis has occurred in our community which calls for prompt and decisive measures. It is indeed favorable that it requires more courage than skill to apply a suitable remedy. It is easier to discuss a tumor or a bile on the surface, than to remove an imposthume from the liver or a cancer from the heart. Besides, the former diseases are more frequently the misfortunes of a good and healthy constitution than the latter.

The spirit and soul of all reformations is free discussion. Every reformation in society has been the offspring of free investigation.—Hence arose the difficulties which have generally checked their progress, or essentially impaired their strength and durability. To set the mind adrift, free from all human authority and control; to grant an almost illimitable indulgence to investigation; to invite all men to reason and decide for themselves on all matters—is always more or less a dangerous experiment, and requires very justifiable objects and ends to hazard all the consequences.

Digitized by Google

Along with this, and kindred to it, is the doctrine of equal authority in all persons—of equal rights to speak and hear on all subjects. In religious agitations this too involves rights of conscience, which are always paramount rights. Hence it follows that this state of society is always favorable to ambitious and demagogical spirits, those everlasting troublers of Church and State! This class of licentious opinionists and agitators eulogize free discussion, liberty of speech, of conscience, and of the press, until their objects are gained; while generally they are themselves the veriest tyrants in the world. Now to withstand such gentry, who have so much philosophy and common feeling along with them, is no very pleasant task; and, indeed, to inhibit this spirit in certain states of society would be not only impolitic, but unjust; and yet not to restrain it would be to keep a community perpetually in a state of revolution.

Foreseeing these tendencies and results, or rather learning from the history of past ages what had always happened in certain circumstances, in commencing the present reformation it was fully argued and submitted that opinions upon all subjects not revealed were private property, and that no citizen of Christ's kingdom had either a right to demand or propound them with any authority whatever. The faith is common to all and necessary to all; for all must walk by it: but no Christian is obliged to walk by the opinion of any man on earth.

We have indeed met with some two or three infallible, or rather indomitable spirits, who, while they admitted the propriety of this course in reference to others, would not be governed by it themselves. Of this class was Sidney Rigdon, of Mormon memory. Exceedingly fond of *new ideas*, and always boasting of originality, he sought distinction by his lucubrations on the Prophecies. He became a flaming literalist of the school of *Elias* (Smith,) a Millennarian of the first water; and becoming more and more restive and ambitious, he dealt out his new and untaught discoveries with an enthusiasm worthy of a better cause. Finally, having discovered the Golden Bible, he and Joseph Smith covenanted for a new religion, and delivered us from a great calamity.

And now I fear we are about to find, or rather have found, in the person of Dr. Thomas, another of these infallible dogmatists, so supremely devoted to his own opinions, and his own glory in defending them—so confident in asserting them—so diligent in propagating them, that, to oppose him is, as he avers, to call the doctrine of the conditionality of eternal life, *materialism*,

Like Elias Smith, from whom he has quoted, but not borrowed any thing, he has run into the grossest materialism, and become a factionist of the most indomitable spirit. I pray he may not run with Elias into universal scepticism, from which that unfortunate old gentleman had not yet fully recovered when I saw him last year in Boston.

But I have now come to the business of this Extra. In the November number we re-published Dr. Thomas' account of a discussion which he held with a Mr. Watt on some of his opinions, and also Mr. Hunnicutt's notice of it; and then followed these notices with some remarks and a declaration of my non-fellowship with him on account of his having become a factionist and having departed, in part at least, from the faith of the New Testament. I knew what I hazarded from various sources when I decided on my duty in the case. But I found myself

Digitized by Google

fully authorized to take the ground on which I have placed myself before the whole community, not merely from the documents quoted in that article, but from a more careful examination of the pages of the Apostolic Advocate.

That I should be compelled to place myself in such an attitude to Dr. Thomas, is to me no ordinary regret; but when forced to this alternative, I choose it with the fullest conviction that it is a duty imposed on me by the Doctor, and with the most unwavering confidence in my ability to justify my course to every candid and impartial professor of Christianity in the whole community.

That I may place this matter in a proper light before my readers, I propose to give in the following order—

1st. A brief narrative of the respective courses of the Harbinger and the Advocate in reference to each other, down to the present time.

2d. The evidence on which we allege his departure from a cardinal article of the Christian faith.

3d. The practical tendency of the new theory of man, and the future state.

4th. An exposition of his sophistry in interpreting and applying scripture in support of the new theory, and in his general reasonings.

5th. The schismatic character of the Advocate.

6th. The duty of the Christian communities on the whole premises.

To proceed with the greatest brevity I narrate as follows:—Doctor Thomas called on me at Bethany on his way eastward, I think in the summer of 1832. He was recommended to me by the brethren in Cincinnati. While he sojourned a few weeks with me I formed a very favorable opinion of his devotion to the truth, his zeal, and general talents; insomuch that I strongly urged him to give himself to the study of the Word in order to general usefulness, and gave him some directions as to the proper field he should occupy. He seemed to acquiesce with me, and finally set out in pursuit of a favorable location. I advised him to go to Eastern Virginia, not as an *Editor*, but as a Physician and a Preacher of the Word, or to serve the brethren as they might choose.

He went to Philadelphia. I saw him there in December, 1833. The brethren in that city in general gave him a good character—said that he improved in the knowledge of the Scriptures; but was too self-opinionated and dogmatical. I apologized for his youth and inexperience, and advised a kind and courteous treatment of him, alleging that this infirmity would wear off in time.

The next I heard from him was his review of the Hughes and Breckinridge debate on Romanism. I commended it. This was followed by a *Prospectus* for the Apostolic Advocate. I published it in May, 1834, with friendly recommendations. He went to Richmond—commenced the Advocate—and in the first number, May, 1834, vaults right into the centre of the Apocalypse. He had written to me some of his speculations on Prophecy shortly after his baptism, designed for publication; but in my mercy for him and myself, they yet lie upon my files. They are as good, however, as much that he has published on that subject.

In the 6th number, Robinson's views of baptism for *dyeing*, a more curious than learned or instructive distinction, of which the New Testament knows nothing, is fully stated and illustrated with an eye to an

Digitized by Google

unmeaning and confounding distinction between baptism and immersion. Robinson's distinction is a whim. *Baptizo* NEVER WAS USED BY ANY GREEK WRITER FOR *dyeing*. *Bapto* is metaphorically so used: *Baptizo*, NEVER. Robinson had little faith in washing away sins through Christ's blood, and consequently less in water; and would rather have turned the *bath* into a *vat*. I regretted to see Dr. Thomas adopt his reasonings, and make an unclassic, unscriptural, and unwise difference between immersion and baptism. He was deceived by Robinson.

He next appears, No. 7, in a profound critical disquisition with brother Walter Scott of Carthage, and finishes by reforming the new version of Rev. i. 7. In seven months more, or in the 3d number, vol. 2, he addresses the church in Baltimore, telling them that his "conviction is, that all who from this time forth may wish to join us from the Baptist denomination (a few excepted who can show just and scriptural cause of exception,) be required to make an intelligent confession and to be re-immersed." The Doctor himself having begun to re-immerse in Richmond, thought good to volunteer very gratuitously this advice to the brethren in Baltimore.

The first offence I gave the Doctor was in my apology for this unprecedented measure, by calling him a "*young*" and "*ardent*" brother. Had he only turned over to my letter to him, published February, 1834, he would have seen that in it I addressed him as "ardent" by way of commendation. But on this occasion he regarded it as deducting from the manhood of his advice and the wisdom of his re-immersion. He was kind enough, however, in return for this favor, to continue to address me from moon to moon on the *meaning of baptism* and its relations to the world and the church. I think these illuminations amounted in all to eighteen brevier pages.

His *thirty-four* speculative questions, full of latent scepticism, on some very important points, were propounded "for information" in the December following. And in two months more Mr. Flippo appears on disembodied spirits.

Thus the Doctor succeeded in obtaining a commencement on his thirty-four speculations. He is instantly engrossed in new theories of man—a future state—the spirits of just men—the original mortality of man—animal and spiritual bodies—future judgment—thief on the cross—Stephen—souls, spirits, blood—the gases—re-immersion, and the Apocalypse, he rises upon us full-orbed—a new and strange light—challenging two worlds, both the Old and the New, to disprove his gospel.

Meanwhile we looked on in mute astonishment, till the Doctor appeared in good earnest determined on proving his new theory, and till we learned that some persons who can feast only on *new ideas*, (for whose Athenian taste the gospel of life becomes insipid as soon as its novelty is over,) were actually holding forth these views as a part of the doctrine of reform.

Painful though it was, it became my duty to take special notice of one branch of the new theory, with a feeble hope that, by a gentle reprimand or exposure of his unscriptural speculations, he would reflect and retrace his wandering steps. But, no! The Doctor had "the truth"—was "sincere, honest," and could argue too, and forsooth was right, and was armed *cap-a-pie* in the field, from which he would be driven only by the point of the sword.

Digitized by Google

But worse than all, he seeks to attach to himself a party from sympathy as a persecuted man. Exclaiming at my injustice to him in not republishing his speculations—I could republish the words of Lord Brougham, Mr. Meredith, Mr. Waterman, and every body; but only the words of Doctor Thomas were proscribed! What could be the reason of this? His words were so scorching, so searching, so illuminating, that I could not endure them; I was afraid of him, or disliked him, and was jealous of his genius! Some, I learned, told the Doctor that he was the only person that could successfully oppose me; while others pitied the injured man—the persecuted brother! Often, very often, were his readers reminded of my injustice to him in not republishing his pieces; and yet, strange as it may appear, he never printed one of my replies!!! Nevertheless, while he was crying out 'Injustice!' I was mercifully laboring to save him from himself and a few mistaken partizans. Yes, while I permitted him to speak of me and to me in a style uncourteous and unchristian without seeming to feel it, and sparing him, he and some others were representing me as unable to defend my views or to disprove his opinions, and rather through conscious imbecility evading the discussion of his new theories.

All this was patiently endured in hope that I might save him from his suicidal course, till his reply to my essays on Materialism extinguished the last lingering ray. More barefaced perversion of scripture and reason, more unblushing sophistry, and, when all the circumstances and relations are considered, more insolent treatment has not fallen in my way during my editorial career.

I resolved on silence for a time, and so intimated. But this was immediately perverted into "a very convenient way of evading very inconvenient arguments"—"a violation of the Christian spirit." And after admonishing me on the sinfulness of defending Protestantism against Roman Catholic accusations, and advising me to leave Catholics and Protestants to fight their own battles, he tauntingly says to his "dear brother," "Will you allow the brethren's minds to be poisoned by my errors—to be perverted by my wild and untaught speculations? Will you calmly look on and see the truth damaged, perhaps destroyed, and not make a continuous effort to silence me, instead of silencing yourself?"*

My silence, then, only emboldened the Doctor to propagate his opinions with more determination, and to treat me with still more disrespect. So far as I was personally concerned, all this would not have provoked a single remark, had not the Doctor appeared on the arena as a public disputant in support of his theory, proposing again to print his arguments against what he is pleased to call "the Platonic doctrine of an immortal soul," in favor of "the conditionality of eternal life, and Phrenology the true philosophy of mind,"† &c. These are phrases which, in Dr. Thomas' sense, we now understand.

The report of this publication and the solicitation for subscribers for the discussion were only the *occasion* of my breaking silence. My complaint is not based on these reports as evidence of the doctrine of the *new* theory, (misprinted in my last number "*nine*" instead of *new*

* Vol, iv. p. 19. † vol. iv. p. 142. See his account of the Debate.

Digitized by Google

doctrines, as appears upon the cover.) They were but the occasion of my new notice of the Doctor's theory.

Having given this narrative of matters and things, I now proceed to my second task, viz.—*The evidences on which we allege his departure from two cardinal articles of the Christian faith.*

The articles denied are "the resurrection of the dead" and "the judgment of the world." The New Testament asserts the resurrectien of all mankind and the judgment of the world by Jesus Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Judge of all mankind. It is scarcely necessary to make two articles of these, for one necessarily implies the other; for if a large portion of human kind are not raised from the dead, but forever remain as the brutes that perish, there is of course no future day of judgment for them, contrary to many scriptures which teach as Paul spoke to the Athenians—that God has appointed a day in which he will *righteously judge the world* by Jesus Christ, *of which* he has given assurance to all mankind by his resurrection from the dead.

The new theory is, that none shall be made alive again but those who have heard the gospel. Such as have obeyed are just; such as have disobeyed it are unjust: therefore, all infants, idiots, insane persons, and Pagans are neither just nor unjust, and shall of course neither be raised to life again nor judged.

Proof: Brother Winans quotes 1 Cor. xv. 22. in proof that the dead shall be raised. To which Dr. Thomas replies, "1 Cor. xv. 22. does not sustain the dogma that Pagans, idiots, and infants are all to be raised again." vol. ii. p. 224. "Hence Pagans who have never heard the gospel, idiots who cannot understand it, and infants who cannot obey, cannot therefore be constituted righteous; and consequently upon them the sentence to justification of life cannot be executed without a violation of the mdiatorial institution." "Some persons," he adds, "may call this speculation, or pronounce it an untaught question; but we affirm, and shall hereafter offer many proofs that the position is true; and if so, we say more, that it is the most sweeping argument against *infant baptism* that has ever been adduced since that superstitious rite was introduced: for granting that sprinkling is baptism, it is manifestly *useless* if babes and idiots never rise again." p. 225.

All this was propounded in the 34 speculative points on which "*information*" was sought in December, 1835. Question 17 thus presents the matter: "Does not the resurrection of 'the just' and of 'the unjust' exclude Pagans who have never heard the messages of God, infants, idiots, and insane?—i. e. do not these at death fall into a state of unconsciousness from which they will never be delivered?" The last two volumes have been furnishing a *Yes* to this question; so that in July last it comes out upon the authority of a revelation. "God," says he, "has as certainly revealed the destiny of infants and of Julius Cesar, as he has plainly made known the way of eternal life." And what is the oracle concerning infants? "Infants will be raised neither to suffer punishment nor to enjoy a life of which they were never conscious." vol. iv. p. 99. Again—"Antichrist has conjured up a salvation and a damnation of infants, and so far hoodwinked the world as to cajole the most of it tnto its reception." vol. iv. p. 101. As to the resurrection of Pagans—Even Mr. Watt in the debate failed to convince him that all Pagans shall be raised. "Such of them will not sleep through endless duration who have rejected the gospel." vol. iv. p. 179.

Digitized by Google

Thus have we proved that it is a fixed and fully established point of revealed doctrine with Dr. Thomas that the dead shall not be raised, but only that small portion of them that have heard the gospel.

Now if one half of the human race die in infancy, and if seven-eighths of the adult nations, the other half, have not heard the gospel, as is commonly believed, not more than one in sixteen of the present inhabitants of the earth shall be raised from the dead; and in past ages not one in ten thousand. "The just and the unjust" added together are scarcely in all time a fiftieth part of mankind; and as those that are neither just nor unjust are forty-nine parts of the human race, the faith of Christians in "*the resurrection of the dead*" must be a rank delusion. This evidence, if it need farther confirmation, will be still farther corroborated as we proceed; but I presume neither the Doctor nor any of his readers will demur to this view of the matter.

The theory of man on which these views are based, is sufficiently simple. It is all contained in a few plain sentences:—1. "Man is but organized and animated dust." vol. iii. p. 216. 2. "His living soul is his animal body"—for they are the same thing, proved by 1 Cor. xv. "The brain designs, the hand executes." He is himself overwhelmed with the simplicity of his theory, and exclaims, "Admirable ingenuity of the Creator in constructing from the dust a reflector of his attributes." vol. iii. p. 217. 3. Again—"The brain secretes thoughts." Here again he exclaims at the brilliancy of his theory, "What a wonderful organ is the brain! How admirable the Creator who organized the dust of the ground so exquisitely as to enable it to perceive, compare, judge and discriminate, and to enjoy the beauties of the surrounding universe." vol. iii. p. 218. 4. "It takes body, blood, and breath to make a whole living man." vol. ii. p. 219.

Now the Doctor declares he believes in angels and such spirits as possessed persons in the days of the Messiah, but refuses to man any thing of the nature of those spirits. He is, then, only a Materialist as far as man is concerned—but *half* a Sadducee: for he confesses angels, but not human spirits distinct from breath; whereas the Sadducees denied both angels and spirits. Man, therefore, is "an animal body, and no more."

The Doctor differs from his contemporary metaphysicians in one very prominent point. They are seeking fame in making a new theory of man, while the Doctor is employed in making a new man for his theory. His man differs from the *monkey* and the *ourang outang* in his stature, weight, color, and superior ingenuity; because he has a few more folds of brain—some half pound of cerebral matter more than any of them in the region of hope, conscientiousness, and veneration. What Moses has said about the counsels of Jehovah in the original formation of man, after the image and likeness of God, is but an Eastern metaphor, designed indeed to give man a high opinion of himself; whereas in truth he was little more worth redeeming than many other mortal beings around him. Moreover, if forty-nine fiftieths of our race perish in all respects as the brutes, philosophy will never be able to justify the perpetuation of our race, rather than the immediate extinction of Adam and Eve on their transgression and the creation of a new pair. But I hasten to—

3. *The practical tendency of the new theory of man and of the future state.*

If man be perishable in all respects as the beasts that perish, and if all infants and Pagans who have not heard the gospel shall never awaken to life more than the insects of a day or the animalculae of a minute, it is a doctrine of immense practical importance, and certainly ought to be extensively divulged to prevent the eternal ruin of millions of our race. It

Digitized by Google

would indeed be cruel, inexpressibly cruel, to send the gospel to China, Japan, or Tartary; because it could not be expected to be more successfully plead in those countries than in Europe or America. And what proportion of the Europeans and Americans shall be eternally damned by it: for without it there is a simple extinction of life as the extinguishing of a lamp, and when a man is unconscious he feels no loss: for having lost himself he can find no pain in the universe. Fifty are damned eternally by the gospel for one that it saves, Dr. Thomas himself being judge. Now I put it to the understanding and conscience of every reader, whether it would not be more cruel and unkind to send the gospel to China to be the occasion of making unjust forty-nine in every fifty, and consequently subject the forty-nine to eternal punishment for the one it saves. And again, he that is saved by it is not saved from hell, from sin; for he was no sinner till the gospel came; and he was only saved from an eternal sleep! What a glorious new gospel is the new theory of man's destiny!!

Indeed the new gospel effectually vacates the old, for the old gospel proposes to save sinners, and there are no sinners now but such as the old gospel makes according to the new gospel. The gospel makes those who obey it just, and those who reject it unjust: hence it condemns many more than it saves; and promises to all mankind who cannot hear it an eternal rest in the bosom of undisturbed unconsciousness.

I shall expose its folly no farther than to say—if the new gospel be true, the mediation of Christ and his sufferings and death are much more malevolent than benevolent; inasmuch as without his interposition, not one would have been forever miserable. But if all mankind are in danger of eternal death, then the gospel of Jesus Christ is worthy of universal proclamation and acceptation, and reflects upon its author an exceeding and eternal weight of glory, beyond all thought and beyond all expression.

4. *An exposition of his sophistry in interpreting and applying scripture in support of the new theory and in his general reasonings*, is the fourth item in our order.

The Doctor's talent for reasoning is not, in my apprehension, such as I once thought it was. He has an admirable talent for finding fault and for saying some fine things, and for saying them handsomely; but he is too precipitate and headstrong always to reason well. As a specimen of his reasoning I can only give a few scraps out of hundreds.

He speaks as though "immortality" and "eternal life" were terms used by us or our contemporaries as equivalent to *endless being* or *perpetual existence*. They are not so used by any man of sense. In biblical language immortality or eternal life in hell is nonsense; but perpetual existence in hell, or in any place, is quite another thought. Now had I inclination or time, I could select many sophisms from the pages of the Advocate in the use of these terms. But in the meantime I only want a few palpable examples:—

1st. He denies perpetual existence to any human being in virtue of his descent from Adam. He also teaches that the unjust, or those who disobey the gospel, shall be forever punished.* Now the question is, whence this perpetual existence to the unjust? From Adam they have it not, says Dr. Thomas; from Christ they have it not, for they are out of him! Whence, then, have they it, Doctor? Unbelief gives them endless being!!

2d. In proof of the utter extinction of all infants, he asks, "What honor or glory could accrue to God by a world of such inhabitants? And what loss would the extinction of their being be to them?" vol. iv. p. 98.

* "As to the *duration* of punishment, there can be no doubt but that it will be eternal in the most extended signification of that word." vol. iv. p. 214.

Digitized by Google

If there is any sense in these questions, they apply as pertinently to Dr. Thomas and myself as to infants. It is as possible for the grace of God through the blood of Christ to make a world of infants born of the degenerate race of Adam as honorable to God, though it may not be done in the terms of the new covenant on earth; as it is by that new covenant to make such poor wretches as we have been an honor to God and heaven. And according to my modes of reasoning, the extinction of my being would be no more loss to me than the extinction of an infant's being would be to it. For being that is extinguished can neither perceive nor feel any loss.* But since it is written, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise," and the "Lord took up infants in his arms and blessed them," I doubt not but as on earth babes in the Temple once shouted "Hosanna to the Son of David," they will treble out their hallelujahs in the skies to Him that sits upon the throne and to the Lamb

He reasons as loosely on the appointment of Elders by the Holy Spirit. Those elected in the ordinary way are merely the incarnation of a majority of votes. To prevent this, he recommends two to be elected by the people for every one they want, and then cast lots which of these shall be the Elder. This compels the Spirit to call one of two which a majority has placed before him. And yet the Doctor does not see that this divinely appointed Bishop is still the incarnation of the vote of a majority only once removed!

But it is in quoting and applying sacred scriptures that this rash, inconsiderate, and sophistical mode of reasoning is most dangerous; and therefore I shall be more careful in exemplifying it.

It will be remembered that we published four essays on one branch of the Materialism of the Doctor in vol. vii. first series. Some seventeen arguments on passages of scripture were advanced by me in those essays. The Advocate replies to them, and, as he says, vol. iv. p. 23., has "driven from the field these false witnesses of a spurious theology."

A few samples of how these 'false witnesses were driven from the field' must suffice:—

1. One of the seventeen was, Heb. xii. 19., "We have had '*fathers of our flesh*' who chastened us. Shall we not be in subjection to the '*Father of our spirits*,' and live?" The witness or argument here was, that, as 'fathers of our flesh,' or *bodies*, was contrasted with 'Father of our *spirits*, the spirits of men were different from their bodies as much as the parentage of each differed. But the Doctor 'drives this from the field' by asserting that *spirits* mean moral dispositions or consciences. "The Father of our spirits," says he, "means the begetter of holy dispositions." vol. iii. p. 88. No living man can show a single instance in scripture or any other book where *spirits* mean consciences or moral dispositions. It is a sheer fabrication. Necessity is the mother of Invention! "*The spirits in prison*," mentioned by Peter, must also, I presume, mean the consciences or moral dispositions in prison!! If any man can show a single instance in the Bible where spirits, mind me, not *spirit*, must mean *dispositions* or *consciences*, I will make him a present of one complete set of the first series of the Harbinger. The spirit of Christ in Noah preached repentance to the moral dispositions in prison who had been disobedient when the Ark was preparing!! &c. "The spirits of just men made perfect" is moral dispositions made perfect.† But worse, if possible, this assertion makes Paul speak nonsense; for our earthly parents are gener-

* Where there is no loser there can be no loss. It is a gross sophism to ask what loss would the extinction of being be to *them*? To whom?—! The being lost!! A lost being can suffer no loss. † Still more unfortunately for our interpreter, the original "τετε-

Digitized by Google

ally as much the parents of our dispositions and sentiments as they are of our bodies. They are so phrenologically and educationally.

2. "But though indeed our outward man is impaired, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." This was advanced in evidence of an *inward man*; but it is 'driven from the field' by the magic wand of the new vocabulary of assertion. "Inward man means fortitude"! vol. iii. p. 32.—Then, in the new interpretation, "though the outward man [cowardice] is impaired, the inward man [courage] is renewed day by day." This is equal to the Baron Swedenborg!

3. I also argued from Paul's words, "when we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord," &c. But the new dictionary here again 'drives me from the field.' The interpreter tells me that "the body" here means the church—"at home in the body means at home in the church." vol. iii. p. 32. Persons in the church are therefore absent from the Lord. Fool that I was, to think that words in the Bible were to be understood by the same rules of interpretation applied to other books!

4. Peter's tabernacle was Peter himself; but Paul's tabernacle was this temporal state; and the mansion or house from heaven, means the new heavens and the new earth. vol. iii. p. 31, 32.

5. Once more—I argued from "Fear Him that can destroy soul and body in hell." But, says the new dictionary, '*body* here means animal life, and *soul* eternal life." vol. iii. p. 277. Then it means, He can destroy your animal life and your eternal life in hell!

6. I might add a hundred more instances of the same sort: such as, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit"—'my life.' "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit"—'my life!' (What an improvement for a disprovement of *spirit!* The lives of just men made perfect! Father of lives! The lives in prison!!) "Animal body"—'a body composed of flesh, blood, and bones.' "A spiritual body"—'a body composed of flesh and bones.' "A living soul" means 'an animal body.' "A vivifying spirit" means "a spiritual body.' "Third heaven" means 'the New Jerusalem age; for the *three heavens* mean three ages.' "Paradise" also (2 Cor. 12.) means 'the New Jerusalem age.' "Carried by angels into Abraham's bosom" means 'carried to the grave by servants.' vol. iii. p. 100, 273, 279, &c. &c. &c.*

Such a system of interpretation drives both myself, all commentators, dictionaries, and the twelve Apostles out of the field. Rules of logic, laws of language, criticism, to such a reasoner, are as straws to Leviathan.

"That immortality is conditional," is a sort of *prove-all* with the Advocate. This reaches not within ten thousand leagues of the points at issue. The controversy is not about immortality and eternal life; for these are terms which in scripture are not always used as synonymes with simple being or endless existence. The Advocate himself admits that some of the dead shall be raised to condemnation, and that this everlasting condemnation is not a loss of consciousness like those who sleep forever, but a positive participation with the devil and his angels in everlasting punishment. Does the Doctor call this immortality? If not, then where is the logic of this oft-repeated saying, "If immortality be conditional, then the dogma of abstract disembodied ghosts vanishes into thin air"? p. 186.

I wish I had room to expose the sophistry of his whole phraseology on this subject. But I have not, and shall only notice another instance of another category. He argues from such places as "Come, see where the Lord lay," "I will go and awake Lazarus," &c. &c. that the whole body,

---

teleiomenon made perfect," applies not to *pneumasi*, spirits, dative, plural; but to *dikaeon*, genitive—just men!!! So that it is "just men," not merely "spirits made perfect."

* See his notice of my Essays on Materialism.

Digitized by Google

soul, and spirit lie in the grave. He might as well argue that Newton thought that the sun ascended and descended in the heavens, because he uses these words. It is a perfect sophism. The person of man is what we see; hence the reason of associating the idea of personality with the human body. But when matters are described not as they *appear*, but as they *are*, what saith the scriptures?—"The body shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Thus when Elijah raised to life the dead son of the widow of Zidon, he says, "O Lord my God, I pray thee let this child's soul come into him again; and the Lord heard him, and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22. And when the Lord raised the ruler's daughter, "he took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid arise; and her spirit came again and she arose straightway." Luke viii. 54, 55. Thus Elijah and Jesus, while they address the body as the person, show that it is only the tabernacle of the spirit.

The deathless nature of spirits may be argued from many sources, but it is proved from such considerations as these:—Jesus says angels cannot die, Luke ii. 36. Why? Not because they are *angels*, but because they are *spirits*. Hence "unclean spirits" live; Satan lives; the antediluvian *spirits in prison* live; the devil's angels or ministering spirits also live in chains till the judgment of the great day. "Art thou come to torment us *before the time?*" &c. &c.

But Dr. Thomas says his "teacher is the word of God alone," and my teacher is "the popular Divines and the Word." vol. iii. p. 294. He ought to have made himself *even* and not odd, by saying, the Bible and the French Physiologists are his teachers. That school has much more to do with Dr. Thomas materialism than either Paul or Peter.

5. A word or two on *the schismatical character of the Advocate.*

1st. Leaving out of sight the items of Christian faith denied by the Advocate, the opinionative character of the work and the dogmatical and pertinacious manner in which opinions are stated and adhered to, renders the publication essentially and necessarily schismatical. Thirty-four volumes would not settle the opinions broached in a single volume of it. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and I suppose the pen writeth; therefore the Doctor is surcharged with curious speculations which a lifetime would not dispose of.

2d. He has not only broached those speculations, but he has challenged the discussion of them; and if I remember right, has defied two worlds to disprove his allegations. "There exists not," says he, "the individual in the Old or New World who can show that we have not successfully maintained it," (his own theory.) vol. iv. p. 23. If this be not a challenge, or a banter, or a gasconnde, I should like to hear one.

3d. The Advocate has been seeking to attach brethren to himself and to alienate from me by *ad captandum* appeals to their sympathy as a proscribed and persecuted man. Many a time have my merciful efforts to save him from himself been perverted into cowardice or dislike, &c. And the fact that a few brethren have been made to feel something of a partizan spirit for or against those speculations, is itself sufficient evidence of their factional tendencies.

4th. In seeking to attach to himself a party, the Doctor has not confined himself to the opinions which he sought to establish by his paper, but has even sought out of our pages and our labors occasion to prejudice against me and to strengthen his hands. For example, his various censures on my defence of Protestantism before he read the book or knew any thing about it; his attempts to represent us as falling into measures dangerous and sectarian—such as co-operative meetings, meetings for those who labor in preaching the word for mutual improvement, and colleges for the education of our youth, which he has called "incipient measures to a new sectarian establishment." vol. iii. p. 46.

5th. His re-immersion for the Baptists, and his no prayer system of preaching the word together with his representing all those immersed among the Baptists as immersed in Antichrist, are strong indications of the schismatical drift of our Apostolic Advocate.

6th, and last of all. The small space which the love of God, the grace of the Messiah, and the great work of man's redemption have occupied on his pages; the little said on the responsibilities, duties, and obligations of Christians, show that the love of the curious and the new greatly transcends the love of the useful and the practical in the writings of the Advocate.

6. *The duty of the Christian community on the whole premises.* On this matter we may suggest a few thoughts, but cannot dictate.

This miniature view of the Apostolic Advocate has been sketched with much examination, though with considerable despatch. I have read the work more fully than ever before, and am sorry to say that its redeeming qualities have greatly depreciated in my view on this more full and careful perusal of its contents. The Doctor has talents, if he had patience to apply them, which might be useful if they were turned into proper channels. But unfortunately he seems greatly to over-rate himself and his acquisitions, and therefore there is not much hope in his case.

Some of our good friends have injured the Doctor by telling him of the exceeding novelty and rarity of his doctrines, and of his singular ability to manage those who oppose him in a way peculiar to himself. Some have spoken of his "noble and independent spirit," and of "the friends of reformation in Old Virginia sustaining him so long as he maintains this noble and independent spirit." Thus my efforts to correct his wanderings have all been neutralized by such sayings. "To charge the Doctor with Materialism and Anabaptistism is unjust and illiberal, when he has publicly disclaimed them." vol. iii. p. 233. Another excellent brother in Alabama now says of his late discussion, "I now beg that you collect

Digitized by Google

and collate all your defence *on this subject* as materials for your next Extra. I will take 50 additional copies. Do comply." vol. iv. p. 212 I know these brethren are excellent men—liberal, noble-minded men. Their motto is, '*Free discussion, no matter what the subject be*'—"*Free trade and sailors' rights.*" But I venture to say that they have not considered the tendency of this course. Suppose one of the editorial corps takes it into his head that the Spirit of God is merely an attribute of God, and avows that the Spirit of a Spirit is to him inconceivable, and that he will go on to maintain his opinion in despite of every remonstrance; will they say to him, Go on, sir! Another doubts the true and proper divinity of the only begotten Son—or takes Sabellian ground, and dogmatizes ever and anon on these opinions; will the brethren say to him that opposes such speculations, 'You ought not to oppose free discussion?' and to him that agitates them and the community, 'Go on, sir—we will sustain you—send me fifty copies!!' Concede the right of dogmatizing on speculative points to one, and you must be impartial and concede it to all.

Liberty of speech and of the press is not with me licentious extravagance nor disregard for the opinions of others; nor is the proper use of our rights the sustaining of every restless demagogical spirit who will be conspicuous for something—for any thing. On all Bible facts, precepts, promises, and declarations—on all its various documents, ordinances, and statutes, we go for free and full and satisfactory discussion; but we say that it is abhorrent to the reformation for which we plead, to propagate mere opinions and speculations; and that it is entirely out of the ground we occupy to favor those who devote their tongues or their pens to building any theory ancient or modern, original or borrowed.

The moment any one becomes a factionist, or even a dogmatist, to encourage him is to oppose the written law, and to summon every true citizen of Christ's kingdom to the walls of Zion to defend the city of our God. We are commanded to "mark them which cause divisions" and offences contrary to the Apostles' doctrine, and to avoid them, because they serve not our Master. This case is a plain one; and seeing we must have a case of this sort, I am glad that it is a plain one. Opinionism must be put down, and kept down, or we have apostatized from the ground on which we commenced. A little bad feeling in a few individuals has been, I learn, evinced already, although not a single preacher in Virginia has embraced the views of Dr. Thomas. This proves it to be a bitter root. The answer I gave to the sister of Lunenburg, I gave with a reference to this discussion. I saw the hand of the Advocate in those questions, and answered them accordingly: and for this reason have dedicated this Extra to all who were startled at said answer.

The Doctor complains of being named invidiously in the course of my remarks. I never intended it; for it is wrong: and if I have even indirectly done so, I am sorry for it. Still were it so, he ought not to complain. He has dubbed more of the mighty dead and of his contemporaries than any college in the land during his editorship. To Calvin's honors he has superadded that of "the Arch Perverter of the Faith of Christ." Calvin never meddled with the faith!! He was laborious in doctrines and opinions. vol. iv. 99. Lord Brougham, and Mr. Taylor, author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm and of various most splendid and excellent works, he has classed with "the gods of this world, whose minds are blinded by the master of evil." vol. iii p. 187. Some of the Methodistic clergy he has dubbed "Draconic Lambs," in honor of the Old Serpent, I presume. And all the Protestant churches and sects are elevated to the rank of "Synagogues of Satan." And even abstract 'Protestantism is one of the horns of the two-horned beast of the Apocalypse." I myself have become with the Doctor "a mere theologian," ignorant of human nature in the anatomical, physiological, and pathological departments; "Mr. Human Tradition," and my critique "ecclesiastical thunder," &c. &c. &c.

I am pained to have to use the lancet and the blister in the Doctor's case. His system demands depletion. I stimulated him when he did not need it; and nothing now can save his life but violent means. He greatly mistakes me and himself too in this delirium. Let him give up his dogmatism, retrace his steps, be content with what is written, and he may yet recover what he has lost. I do assure him and my readers, that I have transcribed this article and made it exceedingly mild in comparison of what the case demands. I have given only a few samples of the ease, the perfect ease with which the Dr's. whole system of speculation can be scattered to the four winds; yet I have never tried my hand seriously to disprove it. I have never called him a materialist of the school of Priestly. He is only half Sadducee: he admits angels and unclean spirits, but denies human spirits in the popular sense. Priestly's materialism is more consistent. The Doctor does not understand his own theory. It is suicidal. May the Lord grant him repentance!

A. C.

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

Accusations, railing, ... 283
Advocate, the Apostolic, ... 145
Apostacy, notes of, ... 15
Assembly, General, proceedings of, ... 367

Bacon College, ... 570
Baptists, proposed reformation among, ... 302
Bible Christians, defection of, ... 76
Bible in Schools, defence of, ... 293
Bible Society, American and Foreign, ... 397
Bigotry, ... 244

Catholicism, Roman, titles of the Pope, ... 49
Christ, all-sufficiency of, ... 60
Christians among the Sects, ... 411, 506, 561
Christian Union, a method of promoting, ... 213
Churches, news from the, 41, 89, 141, 189, 238, 287, 325, 380, 425, 475, 526, 572
Church Reform, principles and objects of, ... 533
Clergy, Irish Catholic, ... 402
Cleaveland Liberalist, ... 35
College, Georgetown, ... 46
Consistency, ... 11
Convention, Baptist, for Ohio, ... 335
Correspondence, special, ... 330
Criticism, biblical, ... 107

Defence, Elder Henley's, ... 234
Debate on Universalism, ... 573
Discussion, public, between Messrs. Thomas and Watts, ... 509
" " Remarks on, ... 511
Discussion, Roman Catholic, ... 94
" " Letters on, 105; False rumors of . . 181
" " Comments on, ... 322
Dispensation of the Gospel, ... 525
Divinity, New School, Presbyterian Church, ... 433

Education, ... 64
" Prussian system of, 65; Girard's College, 190; Steuh. Fem. Sem. 235
England, letters to—No. I. 268; No. II. 276; No. III. 377; No. IV. 428; No. V. 494
Excursions, No. I. 451; No. II. 500; No. III. 544

Falsehood, the power of, ... 97
Fathers, unanimous consent of the, ... 19
" Letter from Clement, ... 20

Gospel Success, ... 528

Holy Spirit, Mr Lynd on the influences of, ... 29, 337
Answer to Mr. Lynd, 340; Mr. Lynd concluded, . . 405
Answer to conclusion, ... 520

Lamphear, J. H. 574

Man the Temple of God, ... 310
Martin Luther and the Monk Erastian, dialogue between, ... 539
Materialism Campbellism, false charges, ... 307

Neophyte's Department, ... 23
Definition of Neophyte, ... 24
Ignorant Questions, ... 72
Vocabulary of Scriptural Terms, . . . 119

October, month of, ... 568
Opinions, Winans on, ... 571
Opinionism, No. I. 439; No. II. 481; No. III. 540

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

POETRY—Our Common Mother, 45; Eternity, 95; First and Last Hours, 144
Harp of Judah, 192 Youth Renewed, 240; The Bible, 480
Preacher, Christian, 574
Preface, 3
Presbyterian Discipline, 419
Presbyterianism vs. the Christian Religion, 508
Prophecy, 27
" Fulfilment of, 123
Prophecies, No. I, 28; No. II. 81; No. III. 169; No. IV. 216; No. V. 250
No. VI. 374; No. VII. 434
Protestantism, 205
Protestant parties, any Christians among, 411
Publications, new, 45, 88, 187, 236, 336, 371
Purcell, Bishop, and Mr. Kinmont, 431

QUEEN Elizabeth, excommunication of, 37
Queen Victoria, proclamation of, 561
Queries, 92, 192

REFORMATION, synopsis of, 330
" Personal and Family, 527
Reformers *not* Schismatics, No. I 145, No II. 193
Reformer, character of, 126
Religion, the power of, No. I. 7, No. II. 112; No. III. 157; No. IV. 205
No. V. 301; No. VI. 490
Religious History, sketches of, 38
Polytheism, 38
Monotheism, 39
Causes of the different religions, 41
Quakers, or Friends, 85
Letter from E. Bates to the Short Creek M. Meeting, 137
ROMANISM, Moral and Political, effects of, No. I. 184; No. II. 223

SCRIPTURES, on reading the, 164
" Misconstruction of, 211
Sectarianism, 445
Seriousness, 118
THINGS New and Old, 38
Times, sacred, 241
UNIVERSALISM, Discussion of—Preliminaries, 68, 120
Universalism, Discussion of, No. I. 175; No. II. 275; No. III. 281; No. IV 346
No. V. 358; No. VI. 385; No. VII. 391; No. VIII. 463; No. IX. 469
No. X. 513; No. XI. 520
University of Alabama and President Woods, 447

VISION of the Past, No. I. 32; No. II. 55; No. III. 100; No. IV. 151; No. V. 200
No. VI. 465; No. VII. 555
WINANS on Opinions, 571

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google